DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 939 EC 182 723

AUTHOR	Noel, Margaret M.; And Others
TITLE	Determinants of Teacher Preparation: A Study of Departments of Special Education. Technical Report.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ., College Park. Inst. for the Study of Exceptional Children and Youth.
PUB DATE	Aug 85
NOTE	179p.; For related document, see EC 182 722.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Disabilities; Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development; Federal Programs; *Preservice Teacher Education; State Programs; Teacher Certification; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The report presents findings from a study of factors influencing the training offered in special education preservice teacher training programs. In-depth, focused interviews solicited information on 11 areas: descriptions of departments, students, and faculty; training priorities, department priorities, interaction with State Departments of Education, federal priorities, local education agencies, opinions of the child deficit model, opinions of separation between special and regular education, and difficulties in the field. Results are summarized for each topic area. Conclusions included that there was surprisingly little variability in terms of perceptions and responses of faculty across states and across institutions with similar size and characteristics; that students were predominately white and female; that almost all departments had experienced recent drops in enrollment; that there was little variability across institutions in terms of training program content, which emphasized working with parents and regular educators and developing assessment skills; that faculty did not view their programs as influenced by changes in federal priorities; and that there was not much evidence of collaboration between local education agencies and departments of special education. The two interview questonnaires used in the study are appended. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED269939

DETERMINANTS OF TEACHER PREPARATION:
A STUDY OF DEPARTMENTS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

TECHNICAL REPORT

Department of Special Education
College of Education
College Park, Maryland 20742

Margaret M. Noel, Carol H. Valdivieso,
and Bruce C. Fuller

August, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Margaret M. Noel
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

College Park, MD: Institute for the Study of
Exceptional Children and Youth
University of Maryland

EC182723

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION.................................. 1

Current Issues in General Education......... 1

Current Issues in Special Education......... 10

METHODOLOGY................................... 22

Research Paradigm.......................... 22

Research Questions......................... 26

Instrumentation............................ 28

Interview Guide......................... 29

The Scales.............................. 31

Conducting the Interviews............... 33

Sampling Procedures........................ 33

Selection of States..................... 33

Selection of Departments................ 35

Interviewee Selection................... 35

Analysis................................... 36

RESULTS....................................... 38

Overview of the States..................... 38

Institutions of Higher Education........... 38

Department Descriptions................. 39

Student Characteristics................. 42

Training Competencies................... 49

Department's Priorities Scale....... 57

Faculty Priority Scale.............. 58

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Department Priorities........................ 59

Department Priorities Scale......... 69

The State Education Agency (SEA)............ 70

Federal Influences........................... 77

Federal Policy Priorities Scale..... 90

Developmental Readiness of LEA.......... 91

Local Education Agencies (LEA).............. 96

LEA Emphasis Scale.................. 102

Child Deficit................................ 103

Separate Versus Regular Education........... 111

Screw-Ups.................................... 118

CONCLUSIONS.. 127

REFERENCES... 134

APPENDIX

I

II

Introduction

Current Issues in General Education

In 1984, the staff at the Institute for the Study of Exceptional Children and Youth (ISECY), at the University of Maryland, undertook a study to examine departments of special education. The study is part of the federally-funded Knowledge Base Project for the Improvement of Personnel Preparation in Special Education which has focused on issues related to manpower and personnel development in special education. The higher education study addressed a number of issues related to special education teacher training programs, particularly the external and internal factors that influence the content and structure of the training offered. This report presents the results of that study; it represents the perceptions of special education faculty members in institutions of higher education (IHEs) on a number of issues affecting teacher training. Specific study questions addressed faculty perceptions of departments, faculty, and students; training, department and federal priorities; the influence of federal and state governments on training programs; the level of emphasis placed by local education agencies on specific areas; the philosophies guiding the field; and, the major problems in the field today.

This study is timely, given the recent interest in education reform which has focused on the quality of educational services and educational personnel. The education reform movement of the 1980s has permeated all levels of American public education. The reforms, both legislated and proposed, are a response to the many reports from various government and private commissions and task forces, professional organizations, and a variety of governmental, business, and political officials noting the poor performance of our nation's teachers and teachers-in-training. From 1983 to 1984, more that 700 pieces of legislation were passed by state legislatures in response to the various reports and task forces. These changes represent attempts to improve the quality and substance of public education and are reactions to issues noted in the various reports (Kaplan, 1985).

The passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, P.L. 94-142, joined special and regular education, and as part of the public education system, special education must address the issues and the provisions of the reform legislation. This section of the report presents an overview of some of the major issues of common concern to regular and special education. They are: quality of teaching personnel; public view of the profession; inadequate pay; recruitment of students into teaching; retention of teachers; professionalism; and the content and structure of teacher education programs.

education reform movement of the 1980s has permeated all levels of American public education. The reforms, both legislated and proposed, are a response to the many reports from various government and private commissions and task forces, professional organizations, and a variety of governmental, business, and political officials noting the poor performance of our nation's teachers and teachers-in-training. From 1983 to 1984, more that 700 pieces of legislation were passed by state legislatures in response to the various reports and task forces. These changes represent attempts to improve the quality and substance of public education and are reactions to issues noted in the various reports (Kaplan, 1985).

The passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, P.L. 94-142, joined special and regular education, and as part of the public education system, special education must address the issues and the provisions of the reform legislation. This section of the report presents an overview of some of the major issues of common concern to regular and special education. They are: quality of teaching personnel; public view of the profession; inadequate pay; recruitment of students into teaching; retention of teachers; professionalism; and the content and structure of teacher education programs.

Issue number 1: Quality of Personnel

Education is not attracting the most academically able students (Feistritzer, 1983; Schlechty & Vance, 1983; Weaver, 1979). Education majors score lower on standardized achievement tests in math, reading and vocabulary, and have lower grade point averages (High School and Beyond Study, 1980). The 1982 Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores show that prospective education majors had lower scores than those intending to enter most other fields (Feistritzer, 1983). The alarming fact is that the gap began to widen in the early 1970s and continues to widen between education majors and majors in other fields (Schlechty & Vance, 1983). Today, prospective teachers' SAT scores are 52 points below the national average in math, and they ranked 14th out of 16 occupation groupings on the SAT verbal test scores (Kirst, 1985).

Issue number 2: Public View of the Profession

In addition, the low status of teachers is one reason given by many able students for not having chosen education, or by teachers for leaving the field (Darling-Hammond, 1984; Feistritzer, 1983; Hodgkinson, 1982; Rodman, 1985). While low pay is frequently identified as the principal factor, it is compounded by other factors contributing to the poor status of the education profession: a lack of community or bureaucratic support; the absence of a professional career ladder; lack of opportunity for growth; absence of rewards; and poor working conditions.

The low status of teachers is reflected in the status of teacher trainers within IHEs. Faculty within schools of education are comparatively low in status in the college and university hierarchy (Lanier, 1984). This low status is exacerbated by the actions of certain IHEs across the country. For example, some of the more prestigious institutions--Yale, Harvard, Duke--dropped their teacher training programs during the 1970s, and the University of California system maintains only small teacher training programs leaving those programs to the second tier of state colleges and universities. Further, IHEs allot less money per pupil to teacher education as compared to most of their other programs (Kirst, 1985).

Issue number 3: Inadequate Pay

The poor pay of teachers is one of the four major reasons given by prospective students for choosing another field over education, and there has been a real and absolute decline in salary over the past decade and a half (Feistritzer, 1983). Sykes (1983) has summarized the bleak economics:

> In absolute terms the purchasing power of the average annual salary for teachers peaked in 1972-73 but declined thereafter; by 1979-80 the average teacher had lost more than $1000 in real purchasing power... Likewise, a recent study comparing teachers' salaries with those of all production workers and specifically with steel

> workers and auto workers found that differentials had shrunk steadily through the seventies so that the salary advantages teachers had enjoyed in the early seventies had disappeared by 1978. (p. 88)

In addition, a teacher's salary peaks after 12 to 16 years. Radical solutions will cost enormous sums; however, many less radical solutions have been proposed to counter the poor compensation within the teaching profession. Merit pay, career ladder advancement, bonus pay and incentives are a few of the ideas suggested to improve the situation.

Issue number 4: Recruitment of Students into Teacher Training Programs

Recruitment of good students into teaching is most important. Of the 1982 college seniors taking the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SATs), only 5 percent said they intended to major in education in college (Feistrister, 1885). Those who traditionally made up the core of the teaching staffs--first college generation males, minorities and females--are now free to choose other professions. Today teaching is not the most attractive option, due partly to the shift in the American economy from an industrial base to a service and knowledge work base which has opened up many new jobs. These new occupations have greater monetary and social rewards and compete for the same people (Lanier, 1984; Hodgkinson, 1983). Unfortunately, the intensity of the competition for able education majors will increase in the near future due to the downturn in the number of students graduating from high schools over the next decade (Hodgkinson, 1985).

The above issues are compounded in the face of meeting the future demand for teachers. We know that we will require approximately 1.7 million teachers by 1993 to augment and replace many current teachers, more than two-thirds of whom will be elementary school teachers (Feistritzer, 1985). We know today that we cannot meet this demand for teachers with the present youth cohort unless recruitment is drastically increased. The teaching force will have to draw from other occupations, or from peripheral occupations such as housewives, mothers, and teacher aides, to fill the teacher training programs. The fear of policy makers is that the proposed solutions may not satisfy the future need for teachers.

Issue number 5: Retention of Teachers

Teacher retention is a growing issue. An increasing number of practicing teachers are becoming dissatified with the profession. It is estimated that one-half leave the profession within the first five to seven years (Kirst, 1985), and that approximately only 60 percent of those who complete a program offering certification enter teaching (Lortie, 1975). Many teachers, about 20 percent, also leave after they have accepted their first teaching job (National Education Association, 1982). It is a situation of selection by attrition, and the ones selected to remain in the profession are not always the most able academically.

Many believe that the more qualified students who do go into teaching do so out of a real commitment and dedication to teaching. However, other occupations require the same personality attributes and offer similar opportunities to work with people and with ideas, but also offer recognition and higher pay.

Issue number 6 : Teacher-A Professional or a Technician?

A profession controls recruitment, entrance, knowledge transmission, generation, codification, and standards. Control is vested in professional organizations whose membership comes from the occupational group. This is not true of teaching; teaching does not have the characteristics of a true profession. Colleges and universities are responsible for knowledge generation and transfer. However, the recruitment of teachers and the selection of those who go into education are not controlled by the teacher training programs in the colleges and universities. Initial recruitment and selection is most often determined by the IHE's administration. Entrance into the profession is increasingly being controlled by public schools which do the hiring, and the state departments of education which establish certification requirements and program competencies. The system, with its contradictory and differing requirements, is inefficient and dysfunctional (Schlechty, 1984). If teaching is a profession it does not resemble other professions. Albert Shanker, the head of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), recently announced that he was forming a group to look into the issue of education as a profession and how it differs from the professions of medicine and law (Philadelphia, 1984).

Issue number 7: Content and Structure of Teacher Preparation Programs

One recent controversy concerns the content of teacher education programs. It is an old debate, emerging periodically, over what teacher education majors should be taught. The debate is illustrated by the positions of two national accrediting organizations and the Holmes Group, representing deans of 25 colleges of education. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) represents 360 state colleges and universities, most of which began as normal schools and teachers colleges. Over 50 percent of the new school teachers certified each year come from the member schools. The AASCU believes that teachers can be adequately prepared in four years; a view shared by the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), which represents 720 of the 1300 institutions that prepare teachers. AACTE, with some overlap in membership with AASCU, represents member schools which produce over ninety percent of the new school teachers each year. The Holmes Group believes a five year program is needed to prepare a professional teacher; that this amount of time is required for the prospective teacher to obtain a four year liberal arts education in combination with teacher training. As of June, 1985, the Holmes Group voted to accept a number of stringent standards for their teacher-training programs, one of which is to offer only master's degrees (Currence, 1985).

Concern over basic teacher supply may drastically alter the emphasis on quality and program content. However, for now the major issue of this era in the development of teacher training is the balance between quality and quantity and how to provide the necessary number of teachers who are well-qualified, committed professionals.

Current Issues in Special Education

Special Education shares the concerns of regular education regarding the quantity and quality of its personnel. However, little information exists describing the characteristics of preservice special education teachers. For special education with its strong legally required service mandates, quality has sometimes had to become a secondary concern to finding teachers to staff programs. However, the recognition that qualified and trained individuals were a critical requirement in the provision of services was recognized in the precursor special education court decisions (Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania) and became embodied in the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) provision of P.L. 94-142. Furthermore, among the earliest special education laws were those that provided funds for the training of teachers of the mentally retarded (P.L. 85-926). This act was a result of the growing realization of the need for professionals with expertise in training or research of the mentally retarded. This act was originally thought to be sufficient to meet the need as it would provide funds to develop an initial cadre of highly trained professonals who would then provide the leadership and the training to others. As it happened, however, this act only set in motion the passage of other categorical aid to the handicapped. Legislation that followed extended the federal government's committment to the training of teachers in all areas of exceptionality (P.L. 86-158; P.L. 87-926; and P.L. 88-164).

Handicapped legislation passed during the early 1970s culminated in 1975 in the passage of P.L. 94-142, The Education of all Handicapped Children Act (EHA). Part D (the Personnel Development section of P.L. 93-380) was not changed; this section of P.L. 94-142 committed funds to the training of personnel to educate the handicapped. Part D, a discretionary program begun in 1966, provides support to promote an adequate supply of qualified special education and support personnel. Under this legislation funds are available not only for the preparation of fully trained and certified special education teachers, but for the preparation of support personnel and regular education teachers. In 1983, Congress reauthorized the discretionary programs, including Part D, under EHA by passing P.L. 98-199. During the reauthorization the House Committee on Education and Labor stated:

> The Committee recognizes that perhaps the most critical element in providing effective services to handicapped children is well-prepared special education personnel. Without sufficient numbers of qualified personnel, the nation will always be a step away from the goal of Public Law 94-142, a free appropriate public education for all handicapped children. The Committee recognizes that personnel shortages continue to be a primary problem in many parts of the country. Programs under Part D have trained the majority of personnel in the field of special education, from classroom teachers to administrators, to university personnel. (Weintraub & Ramirez, 1985, p. 33)

Currently, special education training programs face issues not unlike those cited for regular education. However, there are specific issues within special education that are qualitatively different. The major issues of importance to special education today are: quality and retention of trained personnel, professionalism, teacher training and credentialing, and the separation of the profession from regular education.

Issue number 1: Quality of Trained Personnel

Despite the critical shortages of manpower, and focused attention to this shortage, special education has long been concerned with the quality of its personnel. It is generally recognized thoroughout the profession that without qualified teachers the goal of a free appropriate education for handicapped students can never be met. Even so, since the passage of P.L. 94-142, attention has sometimes been diverted to quantity--to finding the teachers who could be provisionally certified and placed in classrooms for the handicapped.

Preservice training programs in special education have at times not produced the best products (Cruickshank, 1971; Dunn, 1968; Messinger and Hanvik, 1966). Only recently have there been indications of a readiness to look at the quality of personnel and of personnel training programs. Beginning in 1980, a number of jurisdictions began to formulate objectives related to quality in personnel, this effort has in some instances suffered setbacks in progress due to economic and policy changes. Generally, a reduction in funds lessens the attention to quality as administrators concentrate on changing programs and conserving dollars. Yet, the supply of special education teachers is still uneven, and in a recent report on manpower supply and demand (Smith-Davis, Noel, & Burke, 1984), only one of 54 states and localities reported that the supply of new graduates was meeting the demand for teachers. This same report noted that there was a pervasive sense of dissatisfaction among state departments of education and locals regarding the quality of the new personnel. Many of the state department of education representatives felt that special education teacher training programs had not responded to changing needs in the classroom and in the field. Among the most repeated concern was the poor preparation of teachers in the procedural and technical aspects of implementing P.L. 94-142 such as developing IEPs, conducting assessments, and communication with colleagues and parents. In a follow-up of the earlier manpower survey (Noel, Smith-Davis, & Burke, in press), SEA representatives were even more vehement in expressing their concerns over teacher quality. In addition to the procedural areas, there was wide-scale concern about special education teachers' abilities to manage classroom behavior, conduct assessments, develop or adapt curricula, and otherwise provide adequate instruction to their handicapped students.

Despite their concerns regarding quality, state and local education agencies contribute to the problem through their certification policies, particularly the practice of provisionally certifying personnel. While exact figures are not available, every state reports that they have teachers on emergency, provisional, or less-than-full certification because of the shortage of fully qualified people. In the follow-up manpower survey (Noel, et al., in press), one state reported that over a third of their special educators are on temporary certification. The need to fully certify these people has resulted in creation of in-district inservice and a burgeoning of part-time graduate programs in IHEs.

Issue Number 2: Retention of Teachers

The number of teachers employed in special education during the year 1976-77 increased from 179,804 to 241,079 in 1982-83 (Annual Report to Congress, 1985). Although the numbers of special education teachers have continued to increase each year, the proportion of the increase has steadily decreased from the high of a decade ago. The shortages are exacerbated by an inordinately high rate of attrition for special education teachers. The overall range of estimates on the yearly national attrition rate in special education vary from a high of 20 percent (Smith-Davis, Noel, & Burke, 1984), to a conservative six percent (Algozzine, 1982; Slantz & Moore, 1978). However, all agree that attrition is most acute in rural areas. Furthermore, teachers of certain handicapping conditions have a much higher attrition rate. A 5-year study (Smith, 1979) found the cumulative attrition rate in one state to be as high as 50 percent for some types of special education teachers. In addition, Grosenick and Huntze (1981) reported that 20 percent of the preservice graduates of special education programs with a specialization in severely emotionally disturbed do not enter the profession.

Issue number 3: The Professional status of Special Education

Birch & Reynolds (1982) and Kauffman (1980) agree that special education is not yet a bona fice profession but a semi-profession in that it lacks clear delimiting theories and concepts. Birch and Reynolds synthesized the work of seven authors and came up with sixteen criteria that define professions. In the judgment of the authors, special education met only five of the criteria fully, and two equivocally. They note Etzioni's (1969) description of semi-professionals as applicable to special education personnel: "Their training is shorter, their status less legitimated, their right to priviledged communication less established. There is less of a specialized body of knowledge, and they have less autonomy from supervisors or societal control than the 'professions'" (p. v).

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) has attempted to exert control over entry into the profession and has published two sets of professional standards for special education teachers. The first, Professional Standards for Personnel in the Education of Exceptional Children (1966), outlined the content and skill standards of seven categories of special education teachers, administrators, and doctoral programs. A second set was developed by CEC in 1976. These standards updated those developed in 1966 and consisted of recommended guidelines to be followed in recruitment, preparation, certification, and accreditation of special education teachers. These standards were officially adopted by the Council in 1979. The use of the documents has been limited and has not supplanted state certification requirements as the primary determinant of entry into the profession.

In another effort to establish standards the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) recommended a common core of knowledge and abilities for teachers (Reynolds, 1979). The core has 10 components: curriculum, teaching basic skills, class management, professional consultation and communication, teacher-parent-student relationships, student-student relationships, exceptional conditions, referral, individualized teaching, and professional values. This effort to define a common core of knowledge for the preparation of all teachers who deal with exceptionality in children, including regular educators or special eduators, is seen by Birch and Reynolds (1982) as important to establishing professionalism.

Of more importance is the approval by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) of a special education standard. This standard is included in the NCATE Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. This action is significant; NCATE's wide influence offers the possibility of establishing standards in the training of special educators.

Issue number 4: Teacher Training and Credentialing

Currently, entry into the profession of teaching is largely controlled by the state through its credentialing requirements. Certification policies are important considerations in special education because they serve to articulate the requisite skills and level of training required to teach the handicapped. As such, certification is a major determinant of quality as well as a shaper of training programs. Two issues of special concern to special education certification are: 1) level of training (e.g. bachelor's or master's degree); and, 2) categorical vs non-categorical or generic certification. The issue of level of training represents a conflict between quality and economics. Most trainers and local school program administrators consider that special education teachers should possess a good basic general education, a sound background in regular education and normal development and learning, and a high degree of competence in specialized procedural and instructional skills related to the handicapped. Providing all of these skills within a four-year undergraduate major is questionable, and a number of states require a graduate degree for certification in special education. A few undergraduate training programs have become five-year programs. However, because of the cost factor, this is resisted especially by the majority of the smaller, private programs. In addition, local school districts generally want to limit the level of training because the higher the degree, the greater the salary. Thus, entry to the field of special education is subject to the political and economic vagaries within a state and the resultant certification requirements.

The issue of generic v. categorical certification has a greater impact on the education of the mildly handicapped than low incidence areas as the latter frequently require additional endorsements or coursework. The concern over generic certification and degree programs is that teachers tend to lack both experience with the specific types of handicaps they may teach and adequate levels of skill in instructional areas. For example, in the Noel, et al. (in press) study, a number of state education representatives noted local concern about the quality of the generic teachers, frequently noted was a lack of adequate management skills in dealing with the behaviorally disordered student.

A related issue is the K-12 certification which permits teachers to teach across multiple age levels. While such certification provides local districts with ultimate flexibility in deployment of personnel, training programs find it difficult to provide within a four-year program the relevant skills and practica and student teaching across the entire school-age range.

Issue number 5: Regular and Special Education

Special education has in many ways become a dual system within the public schools (Stainback & Stainback, 1984). It is in truth, however, a subsystem of regular education

(Reynolds & Birch, 1982). Since the passage of P.L. 94-142 with its mainstreaming mandate, the issue of the separation of the profession has taken on new meaning. Collaboration and communication with regular educators is necessary for the mainstreamed child to be most successfully integrated into the regular class. Some (Bogdan, 1983; Oakes, 1983; Taylor & Ferguson, 1985) believe that a progressive effort toward collaboration and integration will further the inclusion of the handicapped into society. Proponents of a merger between the two areas of education note that federal initiatives such as mainstreaming, integration, and deinstitutionalization are really efforts to reduce the separation of the two disciplines (Stainback & Stainback, 1982).

Others (Lieberman, 1985; Messinger, 1985) believe that a merger would not result in any additional benefit to the child, and in fact, would take away some of the gains, such as the emphasis on the individual child. The basic rationale for maintaining a separation is that advocacy for special groups has been necessary and remains necessary to ensure the handicapped receive their full legal entitlements.

This has been a brief overview of some of the major issues confronting both regular and special education. Pivotal in any discussion of these issues is the role that higher education and the teacher preparation programs must play. Because of the importance of these programs, the

Knowledge Base project determined that a major focus of its research efforts should be on departments of special education. Particularly, how departments are responding to training needs and how they are being influenced by federal, state, and local bureacracies. Accordingly, the study reported in this document was designed to explore some of the critical issues residing within the special education departments. The following sections describe the methodology, results, and conclusions of the research.

Methodology

The purpose of the study was to examine the content of preservice training in special education and the factors that contribute to, or influence, that content. The basic research methodology responds to this intent. This section describes the research questions and methodology, sampling procedures, instrumentation and the analytical procedures used in the study.

Research Paradigm

The research paradigm selected for this study is qualitative (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). In education, the paradigm is often referred to as naturalistic inquiry because data are collected in natural situations with people engaged in natural behavior (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). The study uses a "discovery oriented" approach which minimizes control and manipulation of variables. This model was selected because of its better "fit" for social/ behavioral phenomena which are seldom context-free. Thus, characteristic of this type of inquiry, we sought information on the differences as well as the similarities found in programs of personnel training. Knowledge and understanding are developed essentially through inductive processes, that is, data are taken from the perceptions, problems, meanings, and values of those interviewed and are then examined for broader patterns and processes. It is from the latter that theory can emerge (Guba, 1978; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Patton, 1984).

Within institutions of higher education, special education programs and departments vary. While sharing one basic goal--the production of special education teachers--programs differ in organization and context, objectives, politics, implementation, outcomes, and quality. Much of this variability cannot be measured solely by quantitative measures, such as a Likert scale, or a "Yes" or "No" questionnaire.

It was our belief that we could not examine the structure and content of personnel training with only statistical or quantifiable information. Instead, we wanted to know what quides the individual teacher trainer in implementing training policies. As we believed it to be their personal assumptions, perceptions, and the influences of their environment, we sought information to complement or dispute, or to enrich whatever statistical data were available. Our study was concerned with the opinions and perceptions, the philosophies, and sometimes the idealism and the frustrations, of those who are the "street-level bureaucrats" (Weatherly, 1979) of personnel preparation. In this study, all persons interviewed had responsibilities for training special education teachers, and therefore, had experienced, to one extent or another, the external and internal factors--from the federal and state bureaucracies, the local schools, and their own institutions--that influence teacher training programs.

The design for this study was formulated following the convening of an Advisory Committee in February, 1984. The committee was comprised of current or former department chairpersons, with varied and extensive experience in teacher training. The advisory committee members included the following individuals: Dr. Phillip Cartwright, Dr. James Kauffman, Dr. Edward Polloway, Dr. Richard Schofer, Dr. Melvyn Semmel, Dr. Stanley Urban, Dr. Alice Watkins, and Dr. William Wienke. The committee reviewed the overall goals of the project as well as the specific research projects planned. In discussing the factors which have influenced departments of special education, the general opinion of the committee was that a qualitative research study utilizing interviews with representatives from higher education would yield the broadest information. Therefore, an investigatory model was selected which would capture and relate the complexities of the situation in higher education. The importance of looking at a diversity of situations in order to gain as much insight as possible became doubly important due to the dearth of literature regarding programmatic influences on departments of special education.

The basic research strategy that evolved entailed obtaining information through in-depth, focused interviews. Focused personal interviews are considered a major strategy in qualitative methodology. In focused interviews:

> ...the persons interviewed are known to have been involved in a particular situation...Secondly, the hypothetically significant elements, patterns, processes, and total structure of this situation have been provisionally analyzed by the social scientist. Through this content or situational analysis, he has arrived at a set of hypotheses concerning the consequencing of determinate aspects of the situation for those involved in it..the third step...developing an interview guide, setting forth the major areas of inquiry and the hypotheses which provide criteria or relevance for the data to be obtained in the interview...The interview is focused on the subjective experiences of persons exposed to the pre-analyzed situation in an effort to ascertain their definitions of the situations. (Merton, Fishe, & Kendall, 1956, p. 3)

An important consideration in indepth interviews is the "recursiveness" of the questioning (Schwartz & Jacobs, 1979). Recursion refers to the extent to which one builds on previous information. Information from the interviews is used to define other questions, to modify or change previous questions, or to expand and probe deeper. It allows the researcher to capture the uniqueness of situations and to build on feedback and prior information (Stainback & Stainback, 1985). The interview guide used in this study was changed somewhat over the course of the research. For example, if we began to get the same basic response to two separate questions, or, if a question yielded limited information, the question was changed, deleted, or converted into a statement that challenged the interviewee's opinions.

Because of the semistructured nature of the interviewing, project staff decided to supplement certain question areas with a set of five structured Likert-type scales. The items within these scales represent more focused versions of four major question areas in the interview guide. In this manner, the data collected through the indepth interviews and the scales yielded multiple indicators for the same phenomenon; the two sources of data corroborated or disputed the phenomenon, thereby, increasing confidence. This technique represents one form of the methodological process of triangulation (Patton, 1984).

Research Questions

The initial research questions were stated as assertions or speculative hypotheses. The basic assertion was that special education programs within the IHEs are strongly influenced by external and internal factors; and that the most important influence has been federal programs and monies. Assertions represented a way of beginning a study in an area with a meager research literature. The use of assertions did not preclude the emergence of theories quite different from the original hypotheses. This flexibility is essential to the discovery, inductive nature of qualitative research (Patton, 1984). The major research assertions that guided the development of the study were as follows:

> That federal policies and resources have contributed to special education department/program attempts to build greater capacity and legitimacy. This growth, however, can not solely be attributed to the federal government.
>
> That in seeking growth and reputation, IHE's may organize their special education department and reshape faculty roles in different ways, becoming more reactive to mandated procedures or credentialing requirements, acting to increase enrollments and funding independent of a cohesive mission, or pursuing a self-determined set of priorities independent of environmental pressures.
>
> That each of these organizational strategies can be influenced by (a) federal and state regulatory action, (b) research and development and technical assistance activity that encourages more locally determined problem definition and solution, (c) directives stemming from actors inside the IHE, but external from the special education department, or (d) initiative taken within the department itself.

Thus, the proposed study areas upon which we might build our interviews are (see Appendix I):

Concrete expansion of the special education department's capacity.
Qualitative character of the department.
Structure and priorities of the instructional program.
Sources of legitimacy and power.
External links.
Defining the special education field.

These assertions, with explanatory detail, were sent to members of the Advisory Committee for their review and critique. Generally, feedback was solicited regarding the validity of these assertions and comments on methodology or question construction. From these comments a first draft of an interview guide was developed.

Instrumentation

The preliminary interview guide and a set of accompanying scales were pilot tested with three faculty members at the University of Maryland. These faculty provided feedback on the content and sequence of the interview questions. Also, scale items were clarified and expanded. Modifications to both the interview and the scales were made, and a second draft was constructed. One of the major changes involved reducing both the number of question areas as well as the scales. These pilot procedures are consistent with those recommended for developing interview questionnaires (see Borg & Gall, 1979; Franchak & Spirer, 1979).

Interview Guide

The guide consisted of 26 major questions subsumed under the following eleven areas (see Appendix II):

Department:

1. Could you describe your department?

Students:

2. How would you describe your students?
3. How has the composition of your students in special education changed over the past five years?

Faculty:

3. How would you describe your faculty?

Training Priorities (Scale):

5. Have there been significant changes over the past five years in the emphasized competency areas?
6. What were the changes in response to?

Department Priorities (Scale):

7. Have you noted a change in departmental priorities over the past five years?
8. What were these changes related to?

9. Were the changes related to federal monies or the lack thereof?

Interaction with State Department of Education (SEA):

10. How does your department work with the state department?
11. Does your department, or a faculty member within the department, have input into your state's certification requirements?
12. Do you have input into the state's requirements concerning the quality or quantity of personnel in special education?

Federal Priorities: (Scale):

13. How have federal priorities affected your department?
14. Has your department received federal grants over the past ten years?
15. How have the grants affected your department?
16. How has the lack of federal grants affected your department?
17. Has the federal government's priorities shaped or changed your department's priorities?
18. Has the LEA emphasis changed on certain items in any way?
19. Is there any conflict between federal mandates and the developmental level of the district or region? How do you handle this professionally?

Local Education Agencies (LEA) (Scale):

20. How would you describe the local education agencies you work with?
21. How have these changed over the past five years?

Child Deficit Model:

22. What has the federal and state policy historically emphasized?
23. Where would you place the emphasis?

Special Education and Regular Education:

24. Do you think the federal government has emphasized special education as a separate profession or as a part of regular education?
25. Where would you place the emphasis?

Screw-Up:

26. What in your opinion is "screwing-up" the field of special education today?

The Scales

Along with the interview, four Likert-type scales were administered to interviewees. The scales were incorporated into the interview and used to enhance the descriptive information. After the initial revisions the scales were restricted to the following five question areas: 1) Teacher Competencies: Priorities of the Department, and, 2) Teacher Competencies: Priorities of the Interviewee; 3) Department

Priorities; 4) The Desired Focus for Federal Priorities; and 5) The Emphases of Local Education Agencies.

After the interviews were completed in the first state, a second set of scales were mailed and interviewees were asked to complete them. Of the 15 items on the two scales used in the first state, a random sample of ten items were analyzed for test-retest reliability using Pearson's r. Nine of the ten items selected and analyzed were .78 or above. In addition to providing some quantifiable data, scales often served as prompts, eliciting information, and discussion of a topic.

In addition to the interview schedule and scales, background questionnaires were developed for individual faculty members and the chairperson (see Appendix II). The latter questionnaire solicited general departmental information and were designed to complement the interviews by obtaining basic descriptive information about faculty interviewed, such as age, sex, highest degree, area of concentration, years in special education and prior work with handicapped children and youth, years of affiliation with the department, and university status (tenure, nontenure, researcher, etc.). The department questionnaire sought information on the number of faculty and types of positions within the department, students, program and curricula, and federal support to the department.

Conducting the Interviews

Most interviews were conducted face-to-face. However, scheduling problems and time constraints necessitated that ten be conducted by telephone. The face-to-face interviews were conducted in two states by one person only. In a third state the interviews were conducted by a team of two, but the participation of the second team member was minimal, because she was being trained. In the remaining two states, two researchers divided up the schedule, visited separate campuses, and conducted all but two of the interviews individually.

Over three-quarters of the interviews were tape recorded and the tapes supplemented the handwritten notes. In the remaining interviews extensive handwritten notes were taken. The interviews were scheduled for one hour; however, they frequently exceeded this time limit. The interviews ranged from 45 minutes to over three hours. Scales were usually administered as part of the actual interview. In about 15 of the cases the scales were left with a stamped self-addressed envelope for the interviewee's convenience. In the case of the telephone interviews, the scales were mailed prior to conducting the interview.

Sampling Procedures

Selection of States

Because our interest was in departments of special education in colleges and universities across the country, we needed to select a broadly representative group, within the limits of available resources. The first task was to purposively sample states that represented diverse or striking differences in order to generate theory (Sellitz, Wrightsman, & Cook, 1976). Selection of diverse situations allows categories or information to emerge which then become patterns of contrasts and similarities. The interrelationships among these patterns then suggest theory. In this sense the theories are grounded, that is, they emerge from data systematically obtained and analyzed (Glaser & Strauss, 1976).

A sample of five states was selected for the study. The number was based partly on monetary and time considerations, but selection was also based on the following:

1. That at least one state be a leader in education, (i.e., this state's actions usually precede those of other states).
2. That there be geographic dispersion within the U.S., with representation of the Pacific, Mountain, New England, Middle Atlantic, and Southern regions.
3. That the states represent a range of state fiscal strength in terms of educational expenditures.
4. That the states represent a range of organizational models for their systems of higher education.

Selection of Departments

After selecting states, departments of special education within individual institutions of higher education needed to be selected. An initial rule was to select three or four departments or programs per state, including: 1) the major research university with a special education teacher training program; 2) a major teacher training institution within the state; and 3) a liberal arts college, public or private, with a special education program. All programs had to offer either certification or endorsement in special education.

Referrals for the initial schools came through contacts with people familiar with a specific state. These three or four schools constituted our primary sample. However, in all but one state, more than three IHEs were visited. When making the initial contacts with a faculty member within an IHE, s/he would often encourage that we visit other institutions in the state, a procedure known as "snowballing" (Stainback & Stainback, 1985). Other institutions were suggested for reasons that included: having faculty members with an historical perspective of higher education in the state, a program of particular importance to the state or region, or, a student enrollment that was unique.

Interviewee Selection

A minimum of three faculty were selected to be interviewed at each IHE. Again, upon recommendation from our contact person at an IHE, we sometimes interviewed more than three people. It was a rare exception, occurring only once, that we interviewed someone not recommended by the contact person at the IHE. In departments of fewer than three, we interviewed all the full-time facutly. We chose, or asked our contact person at the IHE, to select our primary interviewees using the following four criteria:

1. A person with historical knowledge of the training program.
2. A relatively new person on staff, tenure or non-tenure track, who could provide a view of teacher training at the institution uncluttered by history or precedent--a fresh view.
3. Someone who had experience with the grant process.
4. The program head; this person might be the chairperson, the division head, or similar administrator.

Analysis

A transcript was made of all taped interviews, and these were used to supplement notes. For those interviews not taped we made use of extensive notes. Using the procedures suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984), each interview was content analyzed (De Sola Pool, 1959; Kerlinger, 1973). In using content analysis, the transcribed interviews were cut and pasted on 5x7 note cards and sorted by categories. We used the major categories of the interview guide for the coding system. If an item fell into more than one category, copies were made, and the information was placed in all relevant categories.

The categories used in data reduction and analysis are as follows:

Description of Department
Description of Students
Description of Faculty
Training Priorities
Department Priorities
SEA Influences and Interactions
Federal Influences and Priorities
LEA Interactions, Development and Emphases
Opinions of Child Deficit Model
Opinions of Separation between Regular and Special Education
Screw-Ups

Item frequencies, means, and standard deviations were computed for all scales using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program.

Personal and departmental questionnaires were not analyzed because of the small number of usable returns.

Results

Overview of the States

One state from each of the following regions was included in this study: Pacific, Mountain, New England, Middle Atlantic, and Southern. These states were selected according to the criteria specified in the Methodology Section; however, we were also interested in current certification policies. Three of the states had categorical certification and two states had non-categorical certification. Three of the states had, within the past five years, undergone a thorough revision of their certification requirements, one was awaiting legislative action on new policies, and one state was anticipating changes in the near future. Three of the states offered certification upon completion of an approved program of study at the undergraduate level; however, two states permit certification in special education only when combined with certification in regular education (dual certification).

Institutions of Higher Education

Within each of these states, from four to seven special education departments and programs were visited. Of the 25 IHEs, 13 were universities, six were state teacher training colleges, and six were liberal arts colleges. Seven of the 25 IHEs were private institutions, and 18 were public institutions. Three were women's colleges, two were historically black colleges, and two were religiously affiliated. Eleven institutions offered the doctoral program; although for this study we were only interested in teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and master's level. The total full-time student enrollments of the IHEs ranged from less than one thousand to 33,000.

Department Descriptions

Among the departments visited student enrollment figures and numbers of graduate students varied substantially. The total student enrollments in special education programs at the different institutions ranged from 1600 to less than 20, and the number of students who graduated in programs in 1984 ranged from less than 10 to about 250. Two programs had enrollments of 1000 or more, one was between 500 and 1000, nine were between 100 and 500, and the remainder had enrollments under 100.

The oldest special education program was reported to have been established over 50 years ago, and the two most recently established programs began around 1980. Of the remainder, three programs began prior to 1960, twelve began between 1960 and 1970, and seven began after 1970.

At the time of the interviews, all but two of the programs had program approval, meaning graduation results in a state teaching license. The two non-approved programs offered an endorsement at the undergraduate level. However, since the interviews were conducted, one of these two programs has received program approval. Eleven institutions offered a program in special education at the graduate level only; thirteen offered both the undergraduate and the graduate program in special education; and, one offered the undergraduate program only.

The range of certification and/or speciality areas offered within a particular institution ranged from one IHE that only offered an endorsement in mental retardation to two which offered certification in all disability areas. The most prevalent program concentration, offered in all but three institutions, was the area of the mildly handicapped; these programs were usually generic or cross-categorical. Preservice programs in all areas of special education specialization were available in each of the five states.

Faculty Descriptions

A total of 68 interviews were conducted across the 25 institutions. The number of full-time faculty in special education programs ranged from one to over twenty-five tenure-track faculty positions. In six of the institutions, all full-time faculty were interviewed; these were institutions having three or less full-time faculty in special education. In the programs with more than three full-time faculty, the number of interviews ranged from three to seven. In three institutions, part-time faculty were interviewed because they represented an integral, ongoing part of the training program and had knowledge of the program. Two of the part-time faculty had positions which were especially stable.

Forty-eight of the interviewees had tenure, nine held tenure track positions, but were untenured, and the remainder were research associates, instructors, or some similar untenured position. Tenure policies in all but one IHE were traditional. In this IHE tenure was not a requirement for maintaining a faculty position, and therefore, was not a particular concern. The primary criteria for maintaining a position was teaching ability as determined by an annual evaluation, which included feedback from the students as well as the chairperson.

The majority of the faculty interviewed had doctorates in special education. However, some faculty reported having degrees in other areas; for example, four had doctorates in psychology, two in reading, two in regular education, one in child development, and two with combined degrees in special education and vocational education. Four faculty had only the master's degree. All faculty, including those who were in administrative, supervisory, and "soft money," or research positions, saw themselves first as teacher trainers, five added that they also considered themselves researchers, and eight also described themselves as service providers.

In addition to the full-time faculty, most of the programs used part-time instructors extensively, particularly to teach evening or off-campus courses. Also, almost all schools reported the use of part-time faculty to teach courses such as sign language and others in which expertise was needed periodically in specific areas, but the sporadic demand did not to warrant a full-time person. In addition, many programs used faculty from other departments or programs to teach one or more courses in the special education curriculum sequence such as speech and language, human growth and development, vocational education, and psychology.

Student Characteristics

According to the faculty interviewed, the students in their special education programs are similar to the students in regular education on the variables of age, sex, socio-economic status, and race. Acceptable Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT) scores were reported to range from a total combined score of 400 to 1300. Students in the programs were overwhelmingly female, and faculty reported programs had become even more predominantly female over the past five or so years. However, one faculty noted an increase in the number of male students in the Early Childhood program. The majority of the programs attracted white, middle-class students. (Included under the designation of middle-class were the students from "blue collar" families.) Six programs reported that they attracted predominantly lower socioeconomic status (SES) students. In these programs, special education maintained close contact with the remedial skills center in an effort to upgrade the skills of the special education students.

One special education program reported recruiting their students from the school's remedial skills center.

Several features regarding students emerged during the interviews; these included such things as changes in the average age of students, full-time/part-time status, as well as the issue of minority enrollments.

Age. The undergraduate programs attracted students in the traditional age range of 18 to 22. The median age for graduate students was estimated to be in the early thirties. However, one-fourth of the faculty interviewed noted a slight increase in the numbers of older students at the undergraduate level. Although this increase was estimated to be around five percent, it was perceived to be a growing trend within these programs. A few programs did attract younger graduate students and one institution that offered only a master's degree program reported their students to be in their fifties and sixties. These students were bilingual teachers, teaching in special education classes on provisional certification.

Full-time/Part-Time. One significant trend noted by 80 percent of the faculty interviewed was the change among graduate students from full-time to part-time status. This was cited as a major change occurring over the past four to five years. As one faculty stated,

> This represents a major change for us. Most students were full-time four years ago and within

> one year there was a switch to part-time, which is probably due to economic factors. They can't afford to give up jobs to go full-time.

Also, faculty believed that job security was a factor, for even when stipends were available, they had a difficult time finding full-time students to be graduate assistants. In addition to low pay and job security, faculty often cited the profession's lack of a career ladder, and the low status of those in education as disincentives to pursuing full-time study. Some examples of faculty comments:

> The major change is from full-time to part-time, partly because of high tuition...For teachers there is little payoff for a huge expenditure of money; you do not make it back.

> More and more our traditional student is pursuing a graduate degree and working.

Related to the issue of increased part-time students was the lack of creativity and innovation in designing the graduate program to meet their needs. All graduate level programs visited utilized the traditional full-time training model. Except for offering courses at night and off-campus, only four schools reported having given consideration to adapting the curriculum, or examining their training sequences and practicum requirements to meet the needs of the part-time students. Two programs have conducted needs assessments of the teachers in the surrounding area to ascertain the types of courses needed, or that would be most benificial to them. Faculty then developed appropriate training sequences around prospective students' needs. Based on feedback from students in the program, a third program included weekend courses to accommodate the needs of part-time rural students who had to travel long distances to attend courses.

Other factors reportedly influencing the numbers of part-time students are revisions in state education department requirements that force teachers to return to the IHEs for additional credits. Programs in states having recently undergone a certification revision reported an increase in new part-time students. Provisional certification also is a factor affecting numbers of students in graduate courses. Several of the programs reported that the majority of their part-time students were on provisional certification.

Minority enrollments. Overall, there was a marked lack of minority enrollments in the programs we visited. Twelve of the 25 IHEs visited were located in or near major urban school districts where the minority population of the public schools ranged from a low of forty-eight percent to a high of eighty-three percent with a mean of seventy percent. Within these districts the number of handicapped students ranged from four to seventeen percent of the total school population. However, of the 12 special education teacher training programs, only six reported having a ten to fifteen percent minority enrollment. Of these six, three had a majority of minority students. One of the three was an historically black institution, and two others had predominantly foreign born minority students. Of these latter two, one reportedly attracted a high SES foreign student, and the other enrolled a sizeable number of students who recently obtained documentation to work in this country. One other institution attracted a predominantly black student body; it was an historically black institution located in a rural area.

Student recruitment. Most programs relied predominantly on in-state students to make up their enrollments. However, in addition to the two schools with international student bodies, five programs attracted substantial numbers of out of state students. The ability to attract out-of-state students was attributed to program offerings or the reputation of the institution, and was seen by faculty as a very positive indication of program quality.

Student Quality. The issue of student quality stimulated a great deal of discussion among interviewees. Some faculty in eight programs, seven of which were undergraduate, were emphatic about the decrease in quality among their students. This decrease had been occurring over the past five to ten years. Conversely, faculty at two institutions believed that the quality of their students had significantly increased over the past few years. One of these two programs has recently revised its undergraduate curriculum and standards. The faculty in the remaining 15 programs generally reported no change in the quality of students. However, some did remark that there was a slight "dip" in student quality several years ago which now seems to be reversing itself.

When faculty were critical of the quality of students entering their program, most were quick to add that their students demonstrated interest and commitment to children, and were enthusiastic and dedicated during the course of the program. Only two faculty were unqualifiedly critical of their students. The first person believed that many of their students went into special education because it was an easy course of study, and the second person simply said, "They're the worst group of students I've ever had in my life." Examples of other comments made on the quality of undergraduate students:

> Comments on the students with poorer academic skills:
>
> Candidly, a lot of our students are part of the educational environments that we are fighting, which means that we have students that have varying abilities in spoken and written language. We have a writing skills center which services a lot of our students to help them get to the point

where they are regarded as professionally competent in writing skills.

I think I can compare them favorably with students I've seen in a 5th year masters' program in a lot of other places, technically, but not necessarily cognitively. A lot of our students are not, and probably will not be, graduate school material intellectually. They have very large hearts, a good level of sensitivity, and enough cognitive skills -- strong enough cognitive skills to enable them to handle the intellectual challenge it takes to be a teacher.

The quality of students is not now at the top and this is a change from what we've had. But these students try hard and work hard.

Comments on students with higher qualifications:

We still get the cream of the crop, but the brighter they are, the more apt they are to say, 'I want to do this for a couple of years only.' They are well aware of the need to justify to their parents, peers, and others, why they are in education. Very few of the students want to work with the EMR; they want the severe or the mild. They are hard workers, but they have an image of

> teaching as not being work -- they think they love kids, and therefore, they can teach.
>
> I think the students are more conservative...in the past two years. They really want their money's worth. They say, 'I know I have to compete, and I want the best.'

Training Competencies

A major question area in the interview was related to the emphasis placed on certain competencies within the training curriculum. All interviewees were asked, as part of the interview, to rate on a three point scale (1 = low; 2 = average; and 3 = high) 13 competency areas in terms of the emphasis given them by the department. Faculty were also asked to rate (1 = low; 2 = average; and, 3 = high) on a second scale, the emphases they personally give the items.

Tables 1 and 2 present the item frequencies, mean, and standard deviation for both the department emphases and individual faculty emphases. As noted in the tables, the competencies that are receiving the greatest emphases within training programs are "assessment techniques" and "classroom behavior management." The items that received the highest personal emphases ratings by faculty are "communication with regular educators" and "related service disciplines," "learning theory," and "assessment techniques."

There was a consistent pattern of higher personal emphases ratings than perceived department emphases ratings on each item. The three greatest discrepancies between the two ratings occurred for the competency areas of "vocational and career education," and "conducting and using research," and "learning theory," with the largest discrepancy. The least discrepant item was "special education law and mandates;" the faculty considered the high importance placed on this item in the training program to be almost equal to their own high rating of emphasis.

The scale items often served as stimuli for discussions and comments. Among the more prevalent comments made by faculty while completing the scale were related to feelings of frustration of trying to include all the mandated competencies and the program competencies into students' programs. It was not uncommon for faculty to say that an area really should have a full course devoted to it, but due to the restrictions of credit hours and general education requirements, the topic had to be spread haphazardly across several courses. State certification requirements were a major influence in determining competency emphasis, as was a recent increase in practica hours reported by over one-fourth of the programs. As these demands consumed established degree credit hours, programs were reluctant to increase requirements to include additional training for fear of losing or not attracting students. Discussion and comments regarding the individual items follow:

Knowledge of special education law and mandates. Faculty reported the emphasis on this item as being one of the big changes in emphasized competency areas. A real need existed for this training emphasis 10 to 15 years ago, especially after the passage of P.L. 94-142, but beginning about five years ago, programs and individuals began to somewhat de-emphasize the attention. However, every program reportedly includes a thorough treatment of the topic as part of an introductory course. This area is considered an important training competency within program curricula and among individual faculty.

Learning theory. While three-fourths of the faculty gave this item, a high priority, it was the faculty with the longest tenure in teaching, 18 to 35 years, who felt especially strong about learning theory. However, the increasing demands of other competency areas, practica, and student teaching have reduced the time alloted to learning theory. Most faculty accepted the importance of these other demands, making statements such as, "I know that something has to go if we are going to fit in all the things we have to in a student's program."

Philosophical and historical background of special education. The majority of the faculty rated this area as receiving average attention which was consistent with their own emphasis. Most programs appear to address the topic within an introductory course, and this is considered adequate. This area elicited little discussion.

Classroom behavior management. This was rated the second highest competency area in terms of program emphasis. Two-thirds of the departments are perceived as giving this area a high emphasis, but three-fourths of the faculty rated the topic as one they feel is very important. Faculty in one program that conducted evaluations of former students, or pre-tests of students entering master's level programs, stated this area was always rated as needing more emphasis. Faculty, however, considered themselves to be providing thorough instruction in this area, and they were frustrated about how to increase the training.

Implementation of legal procedures/mandates (IEP development, multi-disciplinary team assessments). In terms of departmental priorities, this topic was closely aligned with the item "knowledge of special education law and legal procedures." However, this topic was rated among the highest by individual faculty. In programs that supply teachers to districts which are less sophisticated, or, as one person stated, "having a hard time with 94-142," there was a greater emphasis placed on IEP development and similar procedural areas. This area appeared to be receiving less training emphasis in schools where it was not perceived as a local need. The basis for the de-emphasis was, however, personal faculty perception, not district evaluation.

Development/adaptation of curricula and materials. While not one of the higher rated competency areas, this area was generally acknowledged to be important in mainstreaming efforts and was considered crucial in bilingual special education. Only four faculty discussed this topic as one they attended to in a structured manner. Only one faculty reported doing research in the area. In short, this was an area that received "lip service" but little substantive concern.

Assessment techniques. This was the highest rated area for department training priorities and tied with "learning theory" as the second highest rated personal priority. This was clearly articulated as one of the most important areas in the training of special education teachers. In every program visited, assessment is taught in at least one separate course, with a number of programs requiring more than one course. Individuals also said that this topic is frequently addressed in other related areas. Generally, assessment was viewed as a very technical area requiring extensive training, and was frequently cited as an indicator of program quality.

Conducting and using research. Many faculty reported consumer research, or understanding and use of research by the teacher, was a new emphasis for their programs. One IHE was offering a course in grantsmanship to enable teachers to apply for state funds to conduct classroom research. This came as a result of few responses to state issued requests for proposals (RFPs) for research. The faculty felt that such skills as grant writing and research should be provided to classroom teachers. The ability to conduct and use research was rated higher and discussed more by faculty at the research universities as opposed to the liberal arts schools or teacher training institutions. It was also a much more prevalent concern among younger faculty.

Consultation skills. The importance of this item varied among programs. Some faculty mentioned that this skill was emphasized more at the graduate than the undergraduate level. Those schools that supply most of their teachers to rural districts or large urban districts tended to place more emphasis on consultation skills. In addition, faculty across all training programs in one state tended to give this a high personal rating and noted that their departments were emphasizing this competency because the state was moving toward the consultation model in practice. Therefore, the consultation model was receiving attention in the training program. A number of comments noted an increased emphasis on consultation skills in the local schools despite the fact that the model has been recognized for many years. The most recent emphasis was attributed to economic factors which have increased the number of handicapped students being mainstreamed with the concomitant increase in the use of the resource room teacher.

Communication with regular educators and related service disciplines. This was the first-ranked competency area on the personal emphasis scale. Almost without exception faculty referred to this area as a much needed competency, frequently, brought to the attention of the faculty by local school administrators. And as one person stated,

> How can we expect regular educators to do a good job of teaching our mainstreamed kids if we don't work with them and share information. I know of many cases where the regular teacher was never even shown the IEP.

As a result, many programs have responded by trying to infuse training in this skill area into the existing curriculum instead of establishing a separate course. The increased emphasis was generally cited as being a recent phenomenon, which is interesting given the LRE provision in P.L. 94-142.

Working with parents. This item was considered to be particularly significant in certain areas of specialization such as early childhood. Despite the extensive attention this area has received over the years, the competency area was noted as an emerging one by over a third of the training programs. This interest tended to be attributed in part to a decreased reluctance among local schools to involve parents in their children's programs, and to the increase in early childhood programs.

Techniques for programming for integration of handicapped students into regular school and community. Essentially, the majority of faculty thought that integration was not proceeding as fast or as easily as it should and considered this skill area to be important. However, the specific attention given to training techniques that facilitate integration were not thought to be sufficient, especially at the secondary and post-secondary level.

Vocational and career education. The need for faculty expertise in this area was recognized by one-half of those interviewed. They cited money and available personnel as major impediments to developing training in this competency. This area received the lowest rating in program emphasis and was not highly rated on the personal emphasis scale. Again, this was an area that seemed to generate only "lip service." A faculty member who taught vocational education stated,

> My area has had a boost in the past two years led largely by the initiative in Washington, but also by the programming evolving at the secondary level in special education curriculum as they realize that vocational and career training is an important component.

Other. At the end of the scale faculty were asked if there were any training competencies not previously on the list. Three faculty asked that "computer literacy or

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

Teacher Competencies	Perception of Department's Current Emphases Low	Average	High	Mean	SD	N
- Knowledge of special education law and mandates	1.8%	38.9%	59.3%	2.57	.531	54
- Learning theory	9.3%	61.1%	29.6%	2.35	.638	54
- Philosophical and historical background of special education	14.5%	58.2%	27.3%	2.31	.642	55
- Classroom behavior management	5.5%	27.8%	66.7%	2.61	.631	54
- Implementation of legal procedures/mandates (IEP) development, multi-disciplinary team assessments)	3.7%	37.0%	59.3%	2.46	.609	54
- Development/adaptation of curricula and materials	9.3%	48.1%	42.6%	2.46	.631	54
- Assessment techniques	3.7%	24.1%	68.5%	2.49	.604	54
- Conducting and using research	27.8%	55.6%	16.6%	2.10	.805	54
- Consultation skills	35.8%	30.2%	34.0%	2.13	.819	53
- Communication with regular educators and related service disciplines	15.1%	34.0%	50.9%	2.27	.765	53
- Working with parents	20.8%	28.3%	50.9%	2.25	.772	53
- Techniques for programming for integration of handicapped students into regular school and community	15.1%	35.8%	49.1%	2.45	.645	53
- Vocational and/Career education	39.6%	45.3%	15.1%	[illegible]	.757	53
- Other: (Please specify)						

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Teacher Competencies	Faculty's Emphases Low	 Average	 High	 Mean	 SD	 (N=53)
- Knowledge of special education law and mandates	1.9%	34.0%	64.1%	2.62	.522	
- Learning theory	1.0%	22.0%	77.0%	2.34	.462	
- Philosophical and historical background of special education	7.6%	54.7%	37.7%	2.30	.601	
- Classroom behavior management	3.7%	20.8%	75.5%	2.72	.528	
- Implementation of legal procedures/mandates (IEP) development, multi-disciplinary team assessments)	0%	24.5%	75.5%	2.75	.430	
- Development/adaptation of curricula and materials	3.4%	34.0%	62.3%	2.58	.564	
- Assessment techniques	3.8%	18.9%	77.3%	2.74	.519	
- Conducting and using research	13.2%	43.4%	43.4%	2.30	.689	
- Consultation skills	7.5%	47.2%	45.3%	2.38	.621	
- Communication with regular educators and related service disciplines	0 %	19.9%	80.1%	2.54	.700	
- Working with parents	5.9%	26.4 %	67.7%	2.52	.590	
- Techniques for programming for integration of handicapped students into regular school and community	9.4%	18.9 %	71.7%	2.52	.651	
- Vocational and/Career education	18.8%	37.8 %	43.4 %	2.25	.750	
- Others: (Please specify)						

training" be added to their list; three others added "bilingual education," placing importance on a teacher's ability to assess and instruct bilingual handicapped children; one person added, "language development;" and another added "developmental theory."

children; one person added, "language development;" and another added "developmental theory."

Department Priorities

The second major question area with accompanying scale addressed department priorities. Individuals were asked to rate (1 = low; 2 = average; 3 = high) eight areas that could be possible departmental priorities. Table 3 presents the frequencies, mean, and standard deviation for each of the eight items. The items that faculty perceive as receiving the department's highest priorities are "responding to teacher credentialing requirements and pressures" and "building the department's local reputation for teacher training and local service." Discussion and comments regarding each of the priority items follow:

Department's Priorities Scale

Building enrollments. All but four programs have experienced a decrease in enrollments over the past five years. In only two schools was there disagreement among the faculty in reporting an enrollment loss, with some faculty perceiving a decrease and other faculty reporting stable enrollments. There were no common features among the programs that experienced stable student enrollments. For example, two tended to attract a minority student population from large urban areas, and one was within a selective liberal arts college.

Although the decline in enrollments was a concern to most faculty, the majority of the programs exercise little control over recruitment, and some had no control over admissions. Some faculty expressed the need for faculty involvement in recruitment as evidenced by one person who stated,

> We have no control over who the Admissions Office puts in; there is no allotment. Yes, we need to build enrollments, but we have to do it by our own PR.

Another faculty member from a different program stated,

> They say the key to successful programming is recruitment, recruitment, recruitment, but nobody is willing to put in the time. It is hard work, especially in low incidence areas where you can't rely upon admissions officers to articulate the nature of programs.

Other faculty accepted it as, "That's how it is." The faculty in only two programs reported an active involvement in recruitment. In the first, the faculty went into the local high schools and formally addressed organized groups of students, encouraged them to become teachers, and told them about the training program offered at their college. The other program visited local high schools and junior colleges within the state in an effort to recruit students. Faculty generally mentioned "building enrollments" as a high priority, and that something needed to be done, but they either offered no suggestions or felt it was not within their control to do something about it. Building enrollments was generally seen as the job of the institution.

One consequence of declining enrollments has been the loss of program faculty. One-fourth of the schools visited had lost some faculty during the last five years. On the other hand, about five percent of the schools reported adding full-time faculty in the past five years, primarily as a result of either training or research grants hiring these faculty on "soft money." No programs mentioned they had added new hard money or tenure-track positions.

Another result of the decline in special education enrollments, and the decline in education enrollments in general, has been the reorganization or consolidation of departments of education as reported by eight programs. When the special education program was affected, dissatisfaction had sometimes resulted. In these instances faculty perceived a loss of status and autonomy within the institution and among students and the public schools. Examples of consolidations were when a former department became a program or concentration, or the special education program was administratively placed under regular education. An example of a comment regarding negative feelings associated with consolidation:

> To become a department and be a department for years and then to be absorbed into another department has been detrimental. I think our credibility has been damaged, at least with the public schools, and the students feel...that their major was not important enough to have its own department. The decision was made on credit hour production...

Attracting research dollars. Decreasing enrollments in a majority of the programs, and the resulting faculty work load in teaching, advising, and supervising precluded any consideration of conducting research. In most cases, the administration may encourage, but did not push the research emphasis on faculty, especially at the teacher training institutions. In only one program was there anger over the perceived unrealistic administrative emphasis on research. A comment by one faculty was:

> We teach 12 hours, are expected to serve on committees, talk to students, write and do research. We do the best we can, but it is very difficult.

However, for about twenty percent of the programs, attracting research dollars has become a new priority for education. One faculty said,

> Within IHEs, at least at this one, education was relied upon to bring in the students, our numbers were large and we were given leeway to teach. Now that enrollments have declined there is an emphasis, a push even, which has not been there before, to publish and to do research.

The research "push" in departments reportedly came primarily from the president or dean's office. In some cases, however, the "push" to conduct research came from the individual. For example, one faculty said,

> To me it is very, very important. I don't think a student should pay a good deal of money for a private college education unless they are taught by people who do their own research. However, as senior faculty, I am free to do research, or not to.

In some programs research was not being directly "pushed," but was being encouraged by hiring new faculty who were research oriented. Two recently hired faculty said that they knew the reason they were considered and hired was primarily for their interest and ability in conducting research. While about one fourth of the faculty interviewed did engage in research, about half of these individuals had reservations about the new emphasis on research because it took them away from teaching. This opinion was generally shared by faculty who said they did not engage in research. Yet, there were other faculty interviewed who believed that "Teacher training and research are two primary but parallel missions; they really exist separately, but have equal weight."

Providing inservice training to local special education staff. Offering inservice training to regular classroom teachers. These two separate items were almost always discussed together in terms of doing inservice. These items received the lowest ratings among all priority areas for the departments. Yet, the topic of inservice generated a lot of discussion among the faculty interviewed. Referring to the local schools, a frequent comment was, "They don't come to us." However, at one time when federal funds had been available, inservice in the local schools was a major activity for the IHE faculty. Now funds for inservice are unavailable, and the wealthier local education agencies conduct their own inservice. Yet, most districts were perceived as doing little consistent inservice training.

Many faculty remembered the early days of P.L. 94-142, when a large number of regular teachers had to be retooled. The inservice program during those days was a departmental priority. However, inservice to the local education agencies (LEAs) steadily decreased over its high of ten years ago.

Despite this decrease, the majority of faculty had few regrets over not providing inservice for they did not consider their inservice efforts to have been effective. As one individual commented,

> We are looking for better ways to inservice. One thing we know: You can't change people to change the system unless you work with the people who allow the system to change. And there's no need to inservice until you can be effective.

A more pessimistic view was stated by another person:

> In terms of inservice, the university can train but when they go back to the system they do what they did before receiving the training. In terms of major program and curricula changes, no differences are being made.

Some faculty did inservice training in LEAs as a way to recruit students into their graduate program.

Those faculty who gave inservice a high priority rating, were in programs that have established solid relationships with the local schools over the years. As illustrated by a comment made by one program head:

> We think we really provide a service for our local schools and that's what we are in business for. We have high priority in terms of inservice for

> the regular classroom teacher, and that has been a boon for us recently.

That state education agency had recently mandated that all regular education teachers have a specified number of credit hours in special education, thereby, increasing the number of students enrolled in that program.

Building the department's national reputation for teacher training. Of those who rated this a high priority item, some commented that they actively sought opportunities to present and publish and viewed those methods as a way of building national recognition for their program. Faculty who rated it as a low priority, or an average priority, clearly stated that they were more concerned with building a local reputation.

Building the department's local reputation for teacher training and local service to schools. This item was given the second highest priority; two-thirds of those interviewed considered this to be a high priority. The reason cited by most faculty was that, "They [the local schools] hire our students, and it is important for the survival of a program that it turn out a competent teacher." Faculty also realized the necessity of placing students with the most qualified teachers in the local schools for their practica and student teaching experiences. In addition, graduate programs were generally dependent upon local area students to form the major portion of their enrollment; therefore, having a good reputation as a training program was as one person said, "Survival."

Responding to the credentialing requirements and pressures. This was the highest rated departmental priority. Departments, as a whole, were aware of the need to respond to teacher credentialing requirements. As one faculty said,

> Certainly, every change is responded to; that's what we are in business for, to get students credentialed to teach.

However, some faculty within the departments said they were not touched by credentialing; they teach their courses and let others worry about the overall program of the student. One person commented,

> I think we've gone overboard [on credentialing].

Interestingly, those interviewed in the two states undergoing major changes in certification requirements had a large portion of their energies committed to restructuring their curricula to respond to the new requirements. In one state a massive change occurred three years ago, and faculty reported that they were glad to finally be able to refocus on their teaching activities again. The vast majority of faculty considered attention to certification and licensure a core departmental activity. As one program head said,

> Responding to teacher credentialing and pressures is the bane of my existence, especially with the new changes, which we find obstructive. We really would like to direct our energies elsewhere, but we can't.

Advocacy for the improvement of special education. The high rating given this priority, the third highest, could be interpreted to mean that many faculty are involved in advocacy efforts. A comment similar to many was, "Advocacy, yes, that's what we are all about." However, few persons specified their activities. A small number stated that by virtue of being in the field of special education, a person automatically became an advocate; indeed, many of the faculty interviewed noted that they advocated from the classroom "pulpit." When advocacy activities were specified, involvement included such things as speaking in the community, working with parent groups and/or citizen advocacy organizations, or membership in national professional organizations. A few mentioned working with "Special Olympics," and some were involved in federally sponsored projects which were actively working toward integration of the handicapped into community settings.

A very few mentioned being involved with litigation, including serving as expert witnesses for parents in court cases. This type of active advocacy was only engaged in by a scant minority. One interesting comment regarding this type of proactive advocacy effort, and the dilemma it may

Table 3

Department's Priority

Possible Department Priorities	Low	Average	High	Mean	SD	N
- Building enrollments	17.7%	28.3%	55.0%	2.38	.755	60
- Attracting research dollars	22.0%	30.5%	44.5%	2.25	.794	59
- Providing in-service training to local special education staff	23.7%	40.0%	37.3%	2.12	.767	59
- Offering inservice training for regular classroom teachers	22.8%	36.8%	40.4%	2.18	.775	57
- Building the department's national reputation for teacher training	23.7%	34.0%	42.4%	2.18	.787	59
- Building the department's local reputation for teacher training and local service to schools	6.1%	32.7%	61.2%	2.29	.757	49
- Responding to teacher credentialing requirements and pressures	6.8%	23.7%	69.5%	2.38	.735	59
- Advocacy for the improvement of special education	8.5%	35.6%	55.9%	2.40	.719	59

cause faculty, came from a faculty member who wanted to assume a stronger advocacy position in the local schools but was concerned about the consequences. This person had been asked to be an expert witness for the party(s) suing the school system. The comment was:

> We bite our tongues and the reason is very simple; we have to call on those same districts and ask them to take ten student teachers. I was in a situation where I was asked to be an expert witness...and I declined. It was an impossible situation. I can't go in and make the system look like a fool and then place teachers there.

The State Education Agency (SEA)

The questions regarding the relationships between a program, its faculty, and the SEA generated some of the most vehement discussions. Clearly, comments revealed that the SEA influences were strong on the departments. Almost everyone stated that relations between their program and their SEA were good. However, these interactions were almost exclusively with the Division of Teacher Certification. As one person noted,

> They are two distinct animals -- the state and the university. However, since the state does establish what our certification requirements will

> be, that office is our strongest and most direct link.

When probed, faculty from only four programs mentioned that they presently did any work with the Division of Special Education at the SEA. Consistently, faculty across the states reported that the SEA's Special Education Division did not come to the IHE for advice, assistance, or information. However, all faculty were aware of the substantial influence SEAs have over programs within the IHEs -- too substantial many believe. Of course, the major influence was in the area of certification.

Approximately one-fifth of faculty were positive regarding their interactions with the state department of education, and many of them thought the interaction and exchange were adequate. The faculty-SEA interactions most frequently reported included serving on committees and task forces, attending hearings, or responding to surveys and questionnaires sent from the state department. Some of the representative comments were:

> We have an excellent relationship with the state department. (Name) sends us a letter or asks our input on the standards. Because of our size we cannot be too involved in all the issues we would like to.

> We serve on various committees that the state department has, and evaluation teams too. So we do those sorts of things.

> I have always found them very democratic.
>
> We work very well with the state department. I have been a chairperson on a number of committees -- review teams to review programs in other institutions...we sit on program review committees; we have always been listened to.
>
> We have periodic meetings with the state department where they explain things to us. We went down in June to talk about some of the requirements for accreditation...The whole department takes part.
>
> We've only had one modification since I've been here, and I've been here ten years...there's a big plan in the works now, but it hasn't been approved yet...but I think it's reasonable and not any imposition...we try to be responsive and to give input.

Faculty at four-fifths of the programs felt that higher education really did not have input into certification requirements. That is, they participated in the process of formulating the requirements, but their input was disregarded in the final document. Comments were:

> We have opportunity for input, but I don't know how much they listen.

> At the time the new certification was developed we had input, but left frustrated--our department head and others--and I've gotten the impression so did other university people...so where these final decisions on certification are made, we are not sure. One of the things this project I'm working on is trying to do is to force state department people to take a look at what certification now says...we feel strongly about courses on techniques and methods of...and the state took them out...we thought the state was remiss in taking them out.

As a result, some faculty did not agree with some requirements or were generally dissatisfied with the process. Bitterness among faculty, especially in those who had invested time in the process only to find their suggestions ignored, was not uncommon. As one person said,

> I feel on paper we have input into the certification requirements, but this last time around no one listened. We had a series of public hearings where we all gave our input, but I honestly feel we were not listened to. That was probably the single most disappointing experience since I have been in the state.

A sizable number of individuals felt that certification requirements had fostered a situation of conflicting agendas. There are frequent problems of trying to accommodate the state's requirements, college and university's requirements, and the program's training priorities. About twenty percent of those interviewed in each state voiced strong concern over state credentialling policies. The first issue concerned the direction of the SEA efforts; the SEA was not viewed as trying to improve the quality of teachers, but as a monitor -- counting hours for certification or collecting data. An example of this lack of concern for quality was cited in the practice of credit count. Most faculty believed that receiving a license to teach and not going through an approved program did not enhance the profession's status. Faculty view the problem of provisional certification as a prevalent practice in special education, and one in which the state does not exercise sufficient quality control. The second issue concerned the rationale guiding the effort. In setting certification policies, some faculty thought the SEA was too responsive to the political influence of superintendents, especially rural superintendents, and personnel directors. A typical comment was,

> Rural superintendents are the ones most opposed to increased specialization and more narrow certification. What it allows them to do is hire cheaper teachers. This is my perception: They are looking at it from a purely economic point of

> view, not a programmatic point of view. But the state listens to them.

Despite the strong citicism and negative feelings, there appears to be a definite love-hate relationship between the IHEs and the state. While perceived lack of involvement and lack of satisfaction were rampant, there was general acknowldgement that the certification requirements, and particularly the periodic changes in them, help keep graduate programs in special education supplied with students. Also, at another level, is the conflict between personal ambition and professional concern. Some faculty who do not want to jeopardize their chances for consultant work in the state said they were reluctant to lobby for changes or actively confront state policy. These conflicts appear to depress IHEs' actions and a certain resignation seems to be evident among most faculty. As one individual faculty member said in response to a question about increasing departmental influence with the state,

> Frankly, I don't think we'd know what to do with power if we had it. We don't use the power we have. We have never done anything to embarrass the officials, which we could do. We have the power of knowledge and a certain amount of reputation with the public. One of the jobs of the university is to keep a watchdog eye on these things, and we have almost been seduced by the

> public schools and the SEA. We have courted them because they have something we want--program approval, and the faculty wants to be called on to do occasional consultation...If they [the SEA] got embarrassed two or three times, they would get mad, but they would start to listen, and they wouldn't just brush you off as they do now.

Examples of some of the comments made by faculty members, representative of all five states, regarding SEAs include:

> We get along real well...There is some irritation with the degree to which they dictate courses and course content.

> I don't think that special education is listened to enough. The state department would be wise to listen to the special education faculty, for the state has put things into the credentialing requirements that are foolish, and it is because they don't listen.

> The state does its own thing a lot.

> I work closely from my office with the bureau of certification...and I cultivate the good trust by that department.

> Clearly what we teach is out of the hands of the department. We have a small group calling the shots on what and how much we teach. The people making those decisions are not higher education types; they are probably well intentioned, but they are misinformed.

Certainly, one of the more cogent remarks made by a faculty member regarding the SEA's position was:

> There is a fundamental conflict of interest whenever you have a state department of education responsible for certification of teachers. The state is responsible for both the quality of teachers and the supply of teachers, and those two factors come into conflict. When supply is low, enormous pressures occur to waive requirements.

Federal Influences

One of the primary purposes for conducting this study was to explore the perceived federal influences--programs, laws, and dollars--on departments of special education. All but three of the programs visited had received special education grant money at some time during their history. Only one program was entirely dependent on a federal training grant, and the program head operated with the knowledge that the IHE would not assume support of the program if federal monies were unavailable.

Faculty were questioned about both the positive and negative effects of federal grant money as well as the influence of federal priorities on their departments. When asked about the positive effects of federal grants, programs in some private institutions saw them as a major means of acquiring materials and resources, such as assessment instruments, library books, and other materials and media for their programs. Other programs, both private and public, viewed grants as an enhancement in that the availability of stipends increased the quantity and quality of graduate students despite the difficulty in attracting full-time students.

When the issue of graduate stipends was probed, it was apparent that lack of federal money meant much more to the faculty we interviewed than simply keeping enrollments up. Faculty reported that full-time graduate students enriched programs, particularly in the area of conducting research. Many felt that without the full-time graduate student the special education program was reduced to a mechanical, technical training program, and general morale sank. As one person commented,

> At one time we had 15 or 16 full-time graduate students around; they were a cadre of people who identified themselves as [Name of institution] students, and they were proud of it. They kept you on your toes. It was stimulating and I think I miss that most of all.

One-fourth of the programs experiencing funding cutbacks have sought alternative sources of funding for support of their graduate students, including seeking funds from other federal agencies, the private sector, foundations, and creative and innovative arrangements with local education and human service agencies. These efforts, while small at present, did seem to represent a new trend as departments appear to be be reducing their dependence on federal grant monies. Faculty in most of the remaining programs have either consciously made an effort not to seek grant money, or they have become frustrated after responding to RFPs, and being consistently rejected. Because of these obstacles, they were not presently seeking grant money.

The second most frequently mentioned positive effect of federal funds was the travel money that supported attendance at conventions, or professional conferences, or visits to other programs. Also of importance was the availability of consultant monies that allowed a program to bring in experts or consultants for short or long term interactions with faculty and students. Without such funds, faculty felt isolated from professional peers, and said they didn't know what was going on in research or program development. Many depended primarily on journals or newsletters to keep informed of federal priorities. Interestingly, the need to interact with peers and to be stimulated by ideas was considered to be important to professional growth and innovation, however, it was something that was almost entirely supported by federal dollars.

Federal grant funds also have provided departments with library and curricular materials, assessment instruments, training materials, and computer time for training purposes. This use of federal grant money was particularly important to smaller programs that tended to have decreasing amounts of institutional money to provide these resources. Yet, the primary effect of grants have been their use for student stipends, and this was generally agreed to be one of the more important uses of federal funds.

Examples of comments regarding the positive effects of federal funds are:

> Federal monies enable us to bring our program to the rural areas; they could not come to us, both in terms of time and money. Because of the geography in this state, we need to bring programs to the more remote areas.

> Federal grants have made it possible for us to provide scholarships, to provide summer programs, to provide some demonstrations in the summertime, to provide external degree programs...enabled us to expand our influence over an entire region.

> Two-thirds of our students over the years have had federal support. It is especially important to us because of our high tuition. Federal money has

> enabled us to keep our philosophy of field-based programs, which require a lot of supervision.

The following quotation summarizes the frustration felt by some faculty when federal training money was no longer available:

> The effects of having no training monies from the federal government has been drastic. At first we thought we would have to drop the program...There is no way an early childhood teacher, as opposed to a lawyer, can repay a loan for a twenty thousand dollar degree. Salaries for teachers are so low that teachers can not pay it back. Enrollment has continued to drop, but the university has been supportive and is offering half-tuition scholarships.

In reference to this last comment, the dean of the college of education had been particularly supportive of special education and had used discretionary money to support a program that had lost money. Only a few other programs or specialty areas had been maintained through the efforts of such supportive administrators.

When we probed for the negative effects of federal funding, everyone at first said, "None." However, when pressed, about a third of the interviewees noted some less-than-positive side effects of having federal grants.

Some mentioned "time away from teaching" as the most significant effect. As one person stated,

> They take a lot of my thinking time, my own discretionary time. A lot of the time I should be thinking about what I'm going to do in class is taken by thoughts of what I'm going to include in my next grant.

One department chair thought that grants encouraged too much independence and commented,

> Everyone is doing their own thing. They are being pulled out of teaching, and there is little coordination among the grants or the activities.

The discontinuity of research and program development due to "chasing grant dollars" was also mentioned by several individuals as a negative effect, and another faculty member said,

> Special education suffers from being too applied, there is no unifying knowledge base and the changing priorities fragment the field. We see kids and we see needs, and we know we have to do something, but we really don't have a solid base.

Others spoke of becoming too dependent on grants, and noted that when the big cutbacks came about five years ago, some people on "soft money" positions, but with over ten years at the institution, lost their jobs. Finally, a handful of faculty talked of the time spent writing grants and the frustration in not getting them. About ten percent talked about the frustrations accompanying rejection, and how they had become somewhat "grant shy" after receiving several rejections. Yet, almost all agreed that the positive effects of having a federal grant far outweighed any negative effects.

In response to the question regarding the influence of federal priorities on special education departments, about ten percent, thought that their department had overreacted to changing federal priorities; that federal grant money and the accompanying policies had been influential on departments; and, that programs did attend to the federal focus. Particularly, federal priorities had been primarily responsible for the development and maintenance of programs in specific areas, such as the severely handicapped. Also, some faculty admitted openly that their own position was a direct result of a federal priority or emphasis, such as vocational education or early childhood education. However, few said that federal priorities had really shaped their "core" training program. Faculty believed that federal influence had been powerful in focusing the effort of the department in a specific direction, but that the direction had evolved from the "core" program. Thus, many programs expanded or broadened their focus as a result of a big federal initiative. A comment by an experienced member of a large faculty illustrated this view,

> Programs will restructure to go after money in a new federal initiative. However, initiatives will be left to faculty in particular programs to develop proposals to broaden their programs.

The following comment brings out the less dramatic ways in which programs are affected, even if priorities do not change:

> I have been involved with universities that chase those discretionary dollars--research and demonstration dollars. What comes out in an RFP in terms of new and directed areas by the OSEP, direct a lot of the thinking that goes on in a department: the research emphasis, the direction for some of the coursework, how and when to write grants, how they think about summer obligations, etc. A lot of routine stuff goes into this.

Other selected comments regarding department priorities and federal grants include:

> Whenever there is money available through grants, or whatever, we find it expedient to change our emphasis in whatever it is we are doing to conform to whatever monies are available. It doesn't mean we change our program, the core of the programs

has remained stable. But we do change some things.

Priorities have not affected us, but that's because we are small and limited in the expertise we can draw from. We have developed our own agenda.

The availability of federal money influences the shape of the effort.

The department follows its own initiatives and writes grants in accordance with its strengths.

There have been any number of grants that we have not written because they did not fit. A grant must fit the direction we have as a faculty for two reasons: when they do run out you have not gotten away from your mission, and it is very difficult to write a grant your heart and soul is not into.

The major influence for our funding has been political, more than anything else. The noncategorical approach that we have had in place for years was a civil rights kind of approach, which was especially appropriate during the past years. There is nothing I can see right now as a basic approach.

One of the more summative statements regarding the influence of federal priorities on IHEs was:

> Yes, we're influenced by federal priorities, but I don't perceive that as negative in any way. We use the federal priorities as national trends. We see it as rising to the occasion and we don't see these as out of line with the state's needs.

Federal Policy Priorities Scale

As part of the major question area related to the impact of federal influences on training programs, faculty were asked to rate (1 = less emphasis; 2 = maintain present emphasis; and, 3 = more emphasis) seven items in terms of degree of emphasis they would prefer to see the federal government place. Table 4 presents the frequencies, means, and standard deviations of the faculty ratings. Generally, faculty thought that all items were important and would like to see the federal government put more money into each area; however, when asked to make discriminations, faculty did rate some items more important than others. Comments regarding each of the seven items are presented below:

Development of model programs and work with local schools. Generally, faculty felt that this was an area for the federal government to emphasize and gave it the third highest rating as a priority. Many faculty believed that there were special educators with innovative and creative ideas, who, if given seed money, could make a contribution to the field. Previous model programs were considered to have been valuable; however, some faculty thought that there had not been enough dissemination of information about the previous programs. Another criticism was that the federal funds did not sustain the effort for a long enough period of time for the maximum benefit to be realized. As one person noted,

> Funding should be continued on one effort for a long enough period of time to really see some results. As it is now the money is withdrawn, sometimes at a crucial time, and we aren't able to really see the benefit.

Support of advocacy efforts. This item received the lowest rating of the seven items as a priority to be emphasized. The majority of the faculty thought that the present level of emphasis placed by the federal government was sufficient. Generally, faculty thought advocacy was important, and had been a vital part of the early development of the field, but this item generated very little discussion or concern among all but a very few faculty.

Basic support of teacher training activities within colleges and universities. This item received the highest priority rating by faculty. Faculty emphasized that a special need exists to support programs training students in all low-incidence handicapping conditions because low-incidence programs are not picked up by institutions once federal funding has been discontinued. As one faculty chair stated,

> Few, if any, universities can pick that up; it is not a cost-effective kind of training. We certainly couldn't justify to the university a tenured teacher position with such low productivity and such low returns to the university.

This statement had recently been borne out in another program in which the faculty had tried to establish a training sequence for teachers of the visually handicapped. Although faculty had documented a need for the training, when their requests for funding had been rejected at the federal level, faculty were told by the state that it was not possible to justify a tenure track position for this low incidence area. Therefore, training in the new area of the visually handicapped was not established at this institution.

The positive influence of federal priorities on departments were reflected in the faculty responses to this scale. Many faculty referred to the need to develop very qualified teachers, as this was the mission of their programs. One faculty commented, "Unless we train high quality special educators we are in big trouble, bigger trouble than we are in right now." The majority of the faculty perceived teacher training as one area in which federal funds had been the most beneficial, especially in the area of severely handicapped. As one person commented,

> Much of the training in the severely handicapped is a direct result of the federal training grants.

Encouragement of inservice training of special education teachers and staff. This item was rated fifth out of seven items by faculty interviewed. In their comments, many faculty said that they thought the state should assume the major responsibility for inservice training. However, for specific programs which do some inservice in the LEAs, and for those programs which can see the benefit of a well-designed inservice to the schools in their districts and regions, this received a high priority rating.

Basic research related to child development and disabilities. This item was rated sixth on this scale by faculty. Those who saw it as important thought it deserved more emphasis as it was a growing area of need. Generally, however, comments regarding any question on research were that, first, the current research should be translated into school intervention, and, second, new research should be funded. There was a strong feeling among commenting faculty that the federal government should develop a research agenda and forego the "hit and miss" quality of the present situation. As one faculty stated, "Focus on some aspect of this research effort and plug the dollars into that."

Table 4

	Federal Policy Should Reflect the Following Priorities: Less Emphasis	Maintain Present Interest	More Emphasis	Mean	SD	N
- Development of model programs and work with local schools	3.9%	36.5%	59.6%	2.56	.569	52
- Support of advocacy efforts	1.5%	60.4%	24.5%	2.26	.646	53
- Basic support of teacher training activities within colleges and universities	3.7%	31.5%	64.8%	2.36	.643	54
- Encouragement of in-service training of special education teachers and staff	5.7%	45.2%	49.1%	2.37	.635	53
- Basic research related to child development and disabilities	18.5%	35.2%	46.3%	2.35	.658	54
- Research applied to school interventions	9.3%	29.4%	60.8%	2.38	.661	51
- Promotion of staff development for regular educators	13.5%	34.6%	51.9%	2.37	.668	52

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Research applied to school interventions. Faculty gave this item the second highest rating on the scale, and this item was seen a crucial to the success of mainstreaming efforts in the public schools. However, despite the high rating, there were few specific recommendations or comments that defined the issues or the importance of this area.

Promotion of staff development for regular educators. Rated fourth out of the seven priority items, the majority of the faculty saw this as an important item, but one that could be made the responsibility of the SEA or the LEA. Faculty also reiterated the need to develop better models of inservice.

Developmental Readiness of the Local Education Agency (LEA)

Another question related to federal influences concerned conflicts between federal initiatives and LEA readiness to respond to these initiatives. Specifically, the question was, "Is there any conflict between federal mandates and the developmental level of the district or region? How do you handle this professionally?" To illustrate the intent of the question a situation was given as an example: "A local education agency with no decent secondary program desires or is mandated to respond to the federal interest in transition programs." When first asked, program faculty, almost unanimously, responded that they handled situations, "Very carefully." Many faculty then quickly revealed anecdotes and gave their reactions to the situations. The comments, however, did not address the issue of developmental level, but instead reflected faculty perceptions of LEAs' level of compliance with the law. LEA compliance with P.L. 94-142 was obviously an issue most faculty had thought seriously about at one time or another. The following comments are divided into two groups. The first group consists of a very small number of faculty who saw no conflicts. Comments by this group of faculty were:

> We don't see a whole lot of people grabbing onto a federal initiative...people going to something because the feds push it. I'm sure some do because there is money.

> I am not sure this geographic area has conflicts because of the money.

> ...maybe someone will say...we shouldn't be requiring this.

In the second group of faculty, a majority, did see conflicts between federal priorities and LEA level of compliance. These faculty related situations of conflict observed, or heard from their students or others which reflected a lack of LEA compliance with P.L. 94-142. Their comments were:

> A real problem...for secondary level services are lacking.

> I see this all the time. First, I explain that it is a mandate. In my experiences it is not that they couldn't do it, but that they [teachers] are not developmentally ready. The teachers' attitudes are the first to be worked on. I see it as the teachers; it is their attitudes that are not ready. I believe in affective training before cognitive training. You can then develop skills with training.
>
> We try to do inservice; we try to equip our students through the program to know what those federal priorities are.
>
> I would advise them [LEA] on a consultant basis that they are in violation, and if the college participates it would be in violation. I would advise them to back-track and come into compliance, and make recommendations on what should be done in priority.

Other faculty talked of specific problems either related to their specialty area, or that they had handled because a student teacher brought the problem to their attention. For example:

> Local people do not historically want to change unless they are forced to...most have been dragged kicking and screaming into the 1980s by the law

and by the mandates. In my area it had even more of an impact because Voc Ed is even more recalcitrant in certain respects...perceptions by local teachers that Voc Ed has kind of a tarnished image and they don't want any more handicapped people in there, anyway, to lower that image...but they are changing, and it affects the way I teach my coursework. I still have teachers who don't know anything about special education. It's still attitude development in regular Voc Ed teachers. We're being helped by declining secondary enrollments. Voc Ed is now realizing that special education can build their enrollments and keep their teachers teaching, and that's been a help.

You know I come across this everyday...I teach things you absolutely do need to do to manage a classroom and the students out there are seeing all kinds of atrocities...It's a very touchy subject. What I do, usually, is to go to someone in authority. At the department level there is not much we can do except go out and show them how it's supposed to be done, and how we would like to see it be done according to the mandates themselves. You shouldn't, for instance, have 16 people in a severe and profoundly handicapped classroom. Those things we do see...we are helping by getting out there in the schools and

> seeing how students work, and talking to regular educators and special educators ...actually demonstrate with the students...I was just downstairs talking to a student teacher who was telling me about a woman who was always hitting the students...and the student was asking, 'What can I do?'
>
> Three or four years ago it was a real problem...in several counties there were no services for specific disability areas. We acted as major change agents. A great deal of it we worked out as demonstration grants and in model classrooms. In the severe area there was no instate teacher training program...we now produce teachers.

Generally, faculty use the means available to them to improve situations. These means include, besides the ones mentioned above, artful persuasion, persistence, and other indirect methods of change-making. Again, the cutbacks in district and school fiscal resources were mentioned by faculty as a major deterent to change. As one person stated,

> I don't care how well thought out or data based it is, it is all tied to funding. I hear it all the time; people are told, 'Don't put on the IEP the child's needs [services], we don't have the money.' Same way with transportation; they should have lifts, seat restraints, and aides on the

> buses, but if no funds are available then they don't have them. What the federal government and the state did for special education is beautiful, but they didn't back it up with funding.

Local Education Agencies

The last major question area that included a set of scales was related to faculty perceptions of the efforts expended in certain areas by the LEAs. The eight items of the scales were rated (1 = spending too much effort; 2 = appropriate amount of effort; and, 3 = not expending enough effort). In addition, faculty were queried about the nature of their interactions with local school districts. Overall, the extent of faculty interaction with LEAs varied considerably. One faculty reported consistently spending time each week teaching in public school special education classrooms, and two others teach sporadically in local school classrooms. Five percent of faculty reported that they had very little or no contact with local schools, nor did they have actual knowledge of LEA activities; consequently, they did not complete the scale. Another ten percent completed the scales, but with the understanding that they did not consistently interact with the LEAs so were operating on hearsay. Almost half of those faculty who did complete the scales noted that they had contact with several districts with much variability among them making it difficult to make definitive ratings. The results of the ratings are presented in Table 5, which presents the frequencies, means, and standard deviations of the faculty ratings.

While some individuals did discuss each item separately, there was a general and pervasive tone of negativism. Even in the face of limited contacts, faculty were quick to criticize the local schools for not doing enough for the special education student. The most prevalent opinion of the local schools' attitudes toward the handicapped could be summed by the comment: "I think they think the law [P.L. 94-142] will go away. I haven't noticed too much difference."

Local Education Agencies Effort Scale

Development of inservice training and greater collaboration among school staff. This item was rated fourth by faculty as not receiving enough emphasis by LEAs. As noted previously in the report, a lack of federal funds have sharply reduced the IHEs' involvement in inservice training. However, faculty generally believed LEAs were not taking up the slack, and the inservice being conducted by all but the more affluent LEAs was poor quality. One person commented:

> Locals are doing a very poor job. When the federal money dried up in the early seventies, the locals did not take up the slack. There is a sagebrush mentality about special

> education...because of this mentality, local dollars have not been spent on special education. They did when there was federal money.

In addition, in those states or districts that had experienced large reductions in force (RIFs) in the early 1980's and where regular educators "bumped" special education personnel with less seniority, faculty saw a critical need for increased local inservice.

Many faculty were ambivalent about inservice. On the one hand many believed previous inservice efforts were unsuccessful and that new models were called for; they also believed that inservice was an area in which the SEAs should assume more responsibility. On the other hand, the majority of the faculty believed the LEAs had a need for inservice training.

Assessment and identification of children. Almost half of the faculty interviewed thought the LEAs were expending the appropriate amount of effort in this area. However, faculty made it clear that they were concerned about the issue of assessment and identification in the LEAs, perceiving the quantity of assessments to be more than sufficient, but believing the quality was lacking. Also, faculty were especially adamant in their belief that the LEAs did not always make the best use of the test information in designing the child's educational program. An additional issue of special concern to many was the lack of people being trained to properly assess minority and bilingual child.

Individual faculty expressed concern over some LEAs' activities to cut money in the area of assessment. One faculty noted that public schools, in order to save money, were contracting private psychologists to test and assess the children. The result was problematic, for the contracted psychologists were not then available for core meetings to answer the questions of either the school or the parents regarding the assessment. In another state, psychologists were being hired by LEAs as directors of special education. In order to save money, students in psychology, under the supervision of the licensed psychologist, who was also the special education director, were brought into the schools to test the children. The concern was that: 1) the psychologists who were the local directors knew little about handicapped children and even less about how to educate them; and 2) the students who tested the children (besides not being fully trained) had no accountability to either the school or to the families of the handicapped students.

Implementation of LRE--moving to integrate special education kids into appropriate settings. Slightly over half the faculty interviewed considered the LEAs not to be doing enough in this area. The majority of faculty were concerned with the slow progress of integrating the severely handicapped into the regular schools. However, one program reported having a very successful demonstration project to integrate the severely handicapped into the schools; however, this project had a significant and positive effect on only one county. Also, faculty specializing in the area of early childhood were concerned that young handicapped children were not mainstreamed. As of yet, few public schools maintain early childhood classes, thus handicapped children attend private pre-schools, or schools sponsored by another governmental agency, such as Human Services, with other handicapped children.

While faculty generally agreed that mainstreaming the mildly handicapped had forced greater collaboration between special education and regular education, many faculty were concerned that mainstreaming was occurring because of economic rather than progammatic considerations.

Completion of required paperwork and compliance reporting. The majority of the faculty believed that the LEAs were expending too much effort in this area. Almost all faculty reported that they constantly heard complaints from teachers and students over the amount of paperwork. The concern of most faculty was that LEAs were meeting the letter of the law, but not the spirit of P.L. 94-142. As one person commented,

> Since the paperwork is the one thing that a district can be legally gotten on, they are careful, too careful, to have it all correct with

> the right things down on paper, but that really doesn't always translate into action on their part.

Working to improve teaching practices. This item was rated by faculty as third highest for not receiving enough attention by the LEAs. It was seen as relating to a variety of issues such as: the lack of inservice training, the lack of progress in integrating the handicapped, and generally accepting the handicapped as an integral part of the educational system.

Development of IEPs and working with participants in the IEP process. The majority of the faculty considered the LEAs to be doing the appropriate amount of work in this area. The general belief was that the IEP had been accepted and constantly improved as a document by the school systems. Because it is seen as the legal document, and the crux of P.L. 94-142, the IEP procedural process is attended to in great detail, so much so, that it has become routinized and ritualized. As noted by one faculty member,

> The IEP is too ritualized; it has gone from overkill to nothing, and does not now provide guidance as it was intended to do. The IEP is meant to be a plan, an active document--it is a process. What it has been made into is a legal document.

Table 5

L.E.A. Emphasis

	Spending too much effort	Appropriate amount of effort	Not expending enough effort	Mean	SD	N
- Development of in-service training and greater collaboration among school staff	3.5%	36.8%	59.6%	2.56	.562	57
- Assessment and identification of children	10.7%	50.0%	39.3%	2.29	.647	56
- Implementation of LRE — moving to integrate special education kids into appropriate settings	8.9%	39.3%	51.8%	2.31	.628	56
- Completion of required paperwork and compliance reporting	52.0%	40.0%	8.0%	1.56	.637	50
- Working to improve teaching practices	5.5%	27.2%	67.3%	2.62	.587	55
- Development of IEP's and working with participants in the IEP process	1.8%	65.5%	32.7%	2.30	.500	55
- Attempting new ways of balancing individualized instruction with the integration of handicapped students	3.7%	22.2%	74.1%	2.70	.535	54
- Involving special education staff as schoolwide consultants and "change agents"	3.8%	22.6%	73.6%	2.70	.535	53

Attempting new ways of balancing individualized instruction with the integration of handicapped students. Three-fourths of faculty, the largest percent for any item on this scale, believed that not enough had been done in this area. This item was seen as the key to the success of mainstreaming. However, few people elaborated on this item or provided suggestions for improvements.

Involving special education staff as schoolwide consultants and "change agents." This item received the second highest rating of any item on the scale as an area not receiving enough attention. Generally, faculty agreed that changes had to be made at the building level, and that teachers were the responsible individuals. While it was agreed that this was an important item, no one really discussed how it was to be accomplished other than several references to the implementation of the teacher consultation model.

Child Deficit

The final questions in the interview were more philosophical and were designed to solicit faculty perceptions of the theoretical bases of special education and the basic orientations that guide the structure and content of special education personnel training and programs. The first of these questions referred to the influence of the child deficit versus a more social-environmental model in the field of special education.

Specifically, faculty were asked whether they thought that federal policy had historically emphasized one model over another and if they favored the orientation.

The intent was to probe for the current stance on the basic medical model and the focus on the learner as handicapped. While specific approaches such as diagnostic/prescriptive teaching or aptitude/treatment interaction were not mentioned, the question implied references to these past perspectives in special education.

Responses to the question regarding federal policy emphasis were unanimous. All faculty felt strongly that the federal government had emphasized and perpetuated the child deficit model through the use of categories, labels, and the individual assessment of specific child weaknesses. The resultant mandate to develop specialized programs to remediate these weaknesses served to reinforce the focus on a child's deficits or handicaps.

In terms of agreement or support of this model, responses were evenly divided among three categories: those who supported the basic child deficit approach; those who did not support it but felt that it existed in the operation of special education programs and pervaded the theoretical bases; and those who were non-committal or had no response.

Among the supporters, a small number of faculty (four) in the area of the sensory impaired were adamant about maintaining the focus on child deficits, and the necessity of attending to the unique needs of the handicapped as well as the specialized interventions they require. For example, one faculty said,

> We need to focus on specific needs of certain handicapping conditions, and train personnel in ways that can be specific in meeting those needs. A generalist cannot be all things to all people.

Another person with an expertise in sensory impairment stated,

> As far as the hearing impaired are concerned, the child deficit model is not a bad thing. I'm afraid that if we did not have it...the hearing impaired are easily lost.

Of the remaining faculty supporting a child deficit approach, there were one or two individuals who addressed a basic philosophy and felt that it was appropriate for special education to be focused on the child's needs and deficits. An example of one such comment was, "Yet, certain handicapping conditions require us to teach to the strengths, to concentrate on the skills, not the deficit. We can not change being deficit focused." Other quotes were:

> If you have a handicapping condition and don't have a functional problem, you are not special education eligible.

> I wouldn't throw out the deficit model. We have primitive tools and primitive interventions. Something has to account for the child's performance; we can't isolate it from the social environment, but we need to integrate the two. I do find some kids out there who do have deficits. We don't know much about the deficits.
>
> I think in reality there are kids born into this world with deficits. There are things wrong with them that make it hard for them to function in this world... I think the deficits have to be acknowledged because some people in our society are at greater risk for not being able to deal with the stresses of the environment.

There was also a group that interpreted the question in terms of categories and labeling. While it is difficult to categorize the responses, the following are representative samples:

> We should continue the child deficit model. I would go with that more than the environmental. I would be in favor of dropping the labels and just have mild certification. I do the same kinds of things with MR that I do with LD and ED. They all have problems related to the deficit conditions, labels--whatever.

> We approach from a noncategorical viewpoint. We approach the child from where he or she is and go along with it...I think that fits into the IEP, you know, the present level of functioning.

And finally there was one person who felt that the field still attended to "deficits", but that special education was "Moving toward the functional level of the child; that is, making do the best you can with what that child has...The emphasis now is on taking the child from where they are to where they can go."

Another third, but slightly larger number of faculty, did not support maintaining the deficit model in special education, even though they generally acknowledged that it operated in most of the programs or pervaded the theoretical base of special education. Examples of faculty statements:

> Federal and state policy placed emphasis on the child deficit model. This was somewhat understandable in order to get a start we had to identify these kids and try to see if there were differential service techniques and teaching that would make an impact on these kids. As a whole, the professionals are moving toward the other. The mildly handicapped are moving toward the latter. The federal problem is how to allocate money, and the use of categories and labels enables them to do a head count.

We have advanced from deficit to deficit as we learned more how to detect and identify them. Part of the reason is that was how we organized the public schools; if the child fit the model, he stayed. The way we define a population is deviance from the norm.

The people who influenced the policy had the medical model. The policy has been confirmed in practice. We need to move beyond. The principle is absolutely necessary, but has been ignored.

I think there's too much emphasis on the child deficit model. A child deficit model is too easy a way to develop a reason to not place the handicapped in regular education. The deficit model is driven by administrative convenience more than anything else...It's just too easy to develop a label and identify--it facilitates a cash flow from state to local level because you've got discrete categories of kids that you can fund out at different weighted factors and different states weight it differently.

It has come from the political component in special education. Presently we have to continue the deficit model. If we could back away and look at individual schools and what they could give to all students it would be good. We have to always

> consider the impact on special students. The deficit model is part of the identity of special education.

The vast majority of those who advocated for a move away from the child deficit model spoke of the need to look at "systems," environments, and the ecology in which a child lives and learns. When considering how best to teach the handicapped, some faculty talked about assuming a develomental perspective rather than a diagnostic prescriptive approach, and others talked about building on a child's strengths and helping a child develop learning or congnitive strategies instead of trying to remediate deficit areas. There were also those who viewed "handicapped" as something that resides in the teaching, not the child. Examples of statements made by these faculty are:

> I don't believe you get very far only looking at deficits. You need to know about normal development. Special Education needs to keep normal developmental models in mind when we develop curriculum.

> It's absolutely a mistake to consider special education a child's problem, it's only incidentally a child's problem. The major thing we should be doing is to improve instruction.

> My real belief is that if a kid fails to learn, the teacher fails to teach. That in a nutshell tells you where I sit in that controversy.

> We've got to look at the kid in a broader fashion; specific deficits are part and parcel of the larger environment. I've been doing some work in systems psychology--without the grasp of the social environment--the macrocosm--we can't deal with it.

Finally, an equal number of faculty were either noncommital or gave equal credence to both philosophies. An example of a noncommital response included those who said that an emphasis should be placed on both; two faculty noted that not enough is known about the child deficit model to say that it is more important than the social environmental model. In addition, the following quotations represented a slightly different perspective of noncommitment:

> I would place the emphasis between. Once you develop a model, if you are not careful, it can shift to the social environmental and you still will not be getting a total picture.

> They are both right and they are both wrong. I don't know how to answer that. The bottom line you have on anything is the resources you have available, and the resources are there primarily

> on the basis of what people are willing to pay for. People were willing to pay for a deficit model for a good long time...I think probably one of the problems we have is that when you think about a deficit model, or an environmental deprivation model, whichever, you still look at it from a theoretical point of view which is primarily behavioristic. And it doesn't do it. We have got to have a different point of view.

about a deficit model, or an environmental deprivation model, whichever, you still look at it from a theoretical point of view which is primarily behavioristic. And it doesn't do it. We have got to have a different point of view.

Separate versus Regular Education

A second and somewhat related question that probed faculty perceptions concerned the separation of the field of special education from the broader discipline of education. Specifically, faculty were asked if they thought federal and state policies--programs and funding--had had an influence on the position of special education within the education profession. Faculty were then asked if they would favor maintaining special education as a separate discipline and policy area or would rather see a merger with regular education.

In response to the question, faculty had various reactions to the issue. About ten percent of those interviewed interpreted the question in the extreme and expressed belief that special education should be a separate area within the schools and that handicapped children should not be educated with the non-handicapped. Another third believed that special education should remain separate, but needed to attend to regular education. Approximately one-third of those interviewed stated that they did not believe that special education should remain separate and that more cooperation and collaboration in programming and teacher training were necessary. Finally, about twenty percent of the responses were noncommittal with individuals stating that "attention to both probably was necessary."

Among those who felt that there was a need to maintain a separate identity were faculty who had been part of the developing history of special education and recounted the legal battles fought to secure the right to a free public education for the handicapped. A small portion of this group believed the educational rights of the handicapped had not yet been achieved, and that separation was a factor in unifying the field, providing a strong position for advocacy activities. As the more fatalistic put it:

> I'm not going to live long enough to see the goal of P.L. 94-142 realized--a free appropriate public education for handicapped kids.

> As I look across the country I see that we have an economy of greed and less and less concern for the handicapped, and unless we remain a strong, separate discipline and advocate for the rights of the handicapped we are going to lose those rights.

Although it was generally accepted by most that the education of the handicapped in the least restrictive environment reflected an advance in society's attitude toward the handicapped, there were those few, approximately ten percent, who did not believe that it was a positive move to include the handicapped in the regular schools. These faculty felt that moving the handicapped from more to less restrictive educational environments reduced the levels of service. There were also those who thought the movement toward "mainstreaming" had fostered a loss in identity associated with being a "special" educator. "Mainstreaming has resulted in us losing our identity as a specialized discipline. There has come to be a belief among a lot of my faculty members that anyone can be a special educator." Comments of others holding the view that special education should be a completely separate profession included:

> There are techniques for working with handicapped individuals that are so special that we can't expect the regular educator to develop them. Special educators will always be needed to work with the more severely handicapped.

> I think isolation is out there because we are dealing with kids who can't do whatever other kids are doing; I don't care what the cause is. The isolation is within the youngsters, not within the approach we are using. To work with the kids we have to get them out of an environment that is not responsive to what they need to learn, or to their problems.

Some within this group of separatists were somewhat less adamant about a separate profession. Their stance is well summarized by the following statements:

> I would have two answers, one pragmatic and one philosophical answer. I am very glad that special education is separate. I don't...think we could have done what we have done without it. In the best of all possible worlds, I would like to see special education as non-separate--where all kids' needs can be accommodated; where there does not need to be a separate structure. However, at present I don't think this is a very real model, and I don't think the special ed child will get optimal services under this model. He will be lost.

> Regular education has not in the past assumed the responsibility for the handicapped, and there's no reason to assume that it now will.

> We need to keep special education as a separate field or it will get lost. Regular education will lose it.

Except for the few who wanted to maintain the handicapped in a more restricted environment, all who wanted to maintain the separate profession also wanted to see more collaboration between regular and special education. However, these faculty felt that a lack of a locus of the responsibility for initiating cooperation had generally inhibited action. Those who spoke to this issue believed the place to begin the collaboration between the two disciplines was not at the public school level, but at the IHEs. The following two quotations are representative of those opinions:

> I think regular education people should know the demands placed on their teachers...I am a great believer in organizational structure to establish the patterns of communication, and I would say that the university structures the division of programs in such a way that communication and working together is hampered.

> We need to work with regular educators to help them accommodate the handicapped into their classes...we must begin the process of working with the regular teacher at the preservice level.

> Workshops do not work; Deans Grants do not work; we must find novel ways...

There were a small number of faculty who thought more attention should be given to regular education, and that special education was not a separate profession. Among the comments:

> The intent of P.L. 94-142 was to integrate special education into regular education; that is how you get integration and mainstreaming.

> We are not a separate profession; we are dealing with the same things. We are dealing with the extremes in the population that regular education says they can not handle.

> Since I started teaching kids when there was no special education, I will never agree with special education as a separate entity; it has to be a part of the total school program...Philosophically to separate out the two is a detriment.

> It is time to look at where we have been as a field and to plan for the future. Special education has become to departmentalized, after all, it is just a basic resource to serve kids.

These individuals thought that there should be one profession in which teachers were educated for teaching all children. Almost without exception they stated that regular education "...should contain enough of what we have in special education to make them competent to work with handicapped children."

Within this topic area, the issue of animosity between special and regular education emerged. By-and-large there was very little negativism about regular education within higher education. However, faculty gave few indications of any professional collaboration between the departments of special education and regular education, or by the faculty on an individual basis. Even fewer faculty indicated efforts toward systematically integrating regular education students into special education classes, or vice versa, much less developing integrated curricula or programs.

The majority of the faculty said they still were aware that anamosity existed between regular educators and special educators in the local school districts. Generally, faculty spoke of the animosity of regular educators toward special education. As one person said,

> Animosity has been with us for a long time, particularly since P.L. 94-142 came in requiring so much of regular educators--mainstreaming, taking extra courses, inservice and all the rest.

However, some faculty did speak freely of their animosity toward regular educators, believing one of the main problems of special education was the incompetence of regular educators. One person said, "The greatest task of the special educator is to provide competencies to regular education." Many faculty attributed negative feelings to the poor interaction between regular and special education within the school setting. "It begins with the teacher," was the statement of one person. In one state which offered training in the teacher consultation model many of the faculty spoke of the need for special education to develop communication skills as a competency to better enable special educators to work with regular educators. One faculty, in speaking of the need to develop communication skills in the special educator, summed up the problem and gave a solution:

> Our teachers need to know how to teach adults, so that when they approach the classroom teacher, they must know how to relate the message. Courses must be designed in how to teach another person in an informal way; teachers must themselves be given the skills of a teacher trainer.

Screw-Ups

Preliminary interviews indicated a need for a very general open-ended question to be added to the interview schedule. Thus, the last question of the interview asked, "What in your opinion is 'screwing-up' special education?" Generally, this statement was reinterpreted to mean: "What is wrong with the field of special education today?" or

"What about the field of special education would you change?" As this question was not asked in the first two states, only 47 faculty responded to the question. The purpose of the question was to give people a chance to talk about a topic of importance to them, if they had not had a previous opportunity. The responses to this question, with few exceptions, were elaborations or repetitions of issues previously addressed in the interviews, however, comments were usually made with greater assertion or emphasis. Faculty comments could be grouped under three general topic areas: 1) bureaucratic response to handicapped children's needs; 2) societal attitudes toward the handicapped; and, 3) professional development and competence. An overview of the comments is given below:

Bureaucratic response to children's needs

The majority of faculty commented on the question with a response questioning the intent or the wisdom of bureaucratic decisions with regard to handicapped children. The general tone of the remarks was that all bureaucracies --local, state and national--often make decisions, not out of concern for the child, but out of convenience or political considerations. Faculty responding in this topic area distributed their remarks toward the LEAs, the SEAs, and the federal government with the majority of their remarks directed toward the LEAs. One primary area of complaint addressed economically based, not programmatically based, LEA decisions. Even if the LEAs acted out of fiscal responsibility, examining resources and adjusting services, faculty noted that when budgets were cut, it was the handicapped who were first affected, and often the most affected. As one person said, "Without money, the services are not available; the buck has to stop somewhere, and how much service is allowed is determined by how much money there is."

Also, some faculty noted that some local supervisors placed in charge of special education programs or classes were untrained or lacked training in the law (P.L. 94-142), and the procedural safeguards it contains. One individual illustrated the lack of clear understanding of the legal mandates and provisions of the law regarding the handicapped by describing an incident that occurred to a graduate student who:

> got royally laced out a couple of weeks ago because a supervisor walked into her classroom and found her teaching something to one of her special education students which was not written in the IEP. It was not that she was not covering the things in the IEP, but that she was covering something not written in.

The disturbing fact was that special education policy was being interpreted by someone unfamiliar both with the intent and the substance of special education.

Another common complaint was the use of labels and categories for placing handicapped children; some faculty saw this as a bureaucratic convenience with no instructional or educational value. These feelings were typified by one person's comment,

> As soon as you start to label and categorize, you do generalizations and attributions. You move away from looking at the individual and ascribe characteristics to the individuals in a class. Then you get mob behavior in terms of intervention, treatment, and service. The problem is, we are supposed to be about individualization.

Also, some faculty noted the effect of some school bureaucracies on the morale of the special education teacher. A hostile and negative environment was perceived as stemming primarily from either the lack of a positive bureaucratic response to the needs of special education teachers, parents and students, or the burdensome paperwork and overconcern with legalities of special education. This situation was seen as a major contributor to excessive frustration and eventual teacher "burn-out." In fact, excessive attention to paperwork was one of the most frequently mentioned "screw-ups." One person told of two excellent and experienced teachers who had left the profession because of the unrealistic demands that were placed on them by the system. Even if teacher "burn-out" did not occur, faculty perceived the lack of administrative support and isolation from other teachers as major deterents to the effeciveness of special educators.

Other faculty spoke of their disagreements with state and federal policies hindering the implementation of teacher training programs. The situation was described as one of "too much control and too little understanding." When the state was referred to, the most frequently mentioned "screw-up" was the state credentialing requirements which some faculty saw as dictating the competencies of the training program, thereby, leaving few decisions regarding program competencies to the faculty and the program. The most frequently voiced "screw-up" of the federal government was the inadequate funding it provided for teacher training programs. Generally, these faculty believed that teacher training programs were not receiving the attention they deserved, especially now with the education reform movement and its emphasis on excellence.

Societal attitudes toward the handicapped

Faculty responding to this topic were concerned about the effect of negative attitudes toward the handicapped. They believed negative attitudes were the major inhibitors to the progress of the handicapped in all areas of society, including public school integration. However, consciousness raising and attitude change were thought to be one of the more frustrating aspects of the profession. As one person said in relating a particularly negative comment regarding the handicapped, "What do you say? What do you do? I thought no one thought that anymore, or if they did, they had sense enough not to say it."

One person's remark, similar in tone to many others, was,

> Special education is not accepted by the general society, and the handicapped are viewed as surplus population.

Faculty perceived this negative attitude to be reflected in the attitudes of some public school personnel, ranging from the administrative level to the regular education teacher. One person's comment was,

> I think there is still an attitude among the general public and regular education wishing that special education will go away. They'd get rid of special education in a minute if they could.

Interestingly, two faculty urged the field of special education to look at its own prejudices toward the handicapped, which they perceived as directly hindering the training of more handicapped students for teaching or other education related professions. These faculty thought the handicapped could bring insights, ideas, and understandings to the teaching of other handicapped.

Professional development and competence

Some faculty were concerned with accountability within the profession, while a few were philosophically concerned with special education as a profession. The majority of the faculty belived that teachers continuously needed to upgrade and improve their skills, and that this was one of the tasks of higher education institutions. While there were some different views on how to best accomplish the task, it was clearly seen as a part of the mission of teacher trainers. The major criticism of teacher training programs was that they did not follow-up their graduates to give them support and help them problem solve for a period of time after graduation. One person's comment on this was,

> We educate a person for four years and turn the person out on their own. Instead, programs need to follow-up their graduates 'up to ten years'; teacher education should be a big 'Do-Loop.'

Some faculty saw inservice training as a way to upgrade the skills of teachers, but also, as a way to infuse new ideas and excitement into teaching. As one person commented,

> A strong inservice program can help with those teachers who have been in the profession too long; they have lost their idealism and perspectives on what can be accomplished, and their expectations have become jaded.

Other faculty believed the emphasis should be placed on preservice training. Their concern was that there were not enough "really" competent teacher trainers training teachers. As one person simply stated,

> We need to train competent teachers, but we first need good teachers to train teachers.

Specific skill areas most in need of improvement were pinpointed. The skill areas most often mentioned by faculty as needing improvement were assessment and identification. In addition to improvement in skills, faculty also mentioned the need to use the information from the assessments to plan programs for the students. Also mentioned was the great need to ensure that those persons conducting assessments in the schools know what they are doing. Some faculty recommended that parents be made aware of the situation and encouraged to check the qualifications of the person doing the assessment.

Those few faculty who addressed the need for professionalism in special education spoke primarily of the need for more and better focused research. Faculty noted again how critical it was to translate the present research into practice, and focus research on areas "which we do not know enough about, instead of having continuous replication of studies of the things we know will work--like behavior modification."

Within this group a few faculty addressed the issue of special education as a profession. These faculty believed special education was not a profession, and were quick to give their reasons:

> I don't think it is a profession. There is no cohesion. Each specialty area is only concerned with itself. For special education to advance there should be some effort to plan agendas for the whole, not just the separate parts.
>
> We as a profession haven't developed a quality of our own work. Are we psychology or are we something else? What we have generated...most of the substantive stuff comes from outside of special education--from psychology, law, educational research. The problems are remedied by outsiders. We don't understand our field, and we are wrestling with what we are. There is no integrated philosophy, discipline, no real professional research journals. In essence, there is no coherent, cohesive discipline.

Conclusions

The sum of the study should be greater than its parts; thus, this section will attempt to integrate some of the results as well as present major trends. Perhaps the first observation is that there was surprisingly little variability in terms of perceptions and responses of faculty across states and across institutions of the same size and characteristics. Interestingly, while we selected states that could provide us with different economic and demographic features, we did not find any blatant differences. There was perhaps only one area in which we found some differentiation among departments and that was the impact of state certification requirements. However, the differences were in the tone of the comments and the level of dissatisfaction and not in the nature of the impact. IHEs in all states generally felt powerless in the face of state certification policies and felt that these policies did little to enhance the quality of personnel. However, in states that were currently undergoing, or had recently undergone, major revisions, faculty tended to be more agitated and disgruntled.

Turning now to trends or major issues that seemed to emerge from the results, we see first that the basic characteristics of the undergraduate students--white and female--differ little among institutions. At the graduate level almost every institution has experienced, in the past five or so years, a change from a full-time graduate school population to one that is part-time. At this level, the students are still primarily female and white, although some departments in close proximity to large urban school districts do draw slightly more minority students. However, the primary student population at both the undergraduate and graduate levels is predominantly female and white.

Faculty across all types of institutions see themselves first and foremost as teacher trainers and expressed pride in this role. No one was either apologetic or equivocal about the importance of training special educators. Some younger faculty and faculty at the major research universities classified themselves, secondarily, as researchers.

Almost all of the departments had experienced recent drops in enrollments; however, the enrollments had generally stabilized, and in a few cases had shown a slight upturn. As a result of the decrease in enrollments a number of departments had reportedly lost status in their institutions, not to mention basic resources. A second departmental trend was that a sizeable number of faculty members noted a new research emphasis within their department or college. In some cases this was an attempt on the part of higher administration to upgrade the reputation of a teacher training institution. In other instances, the new emphasis occurred with the drop in enrollments, and now as maintaining faculty positions becomes more competitive scholarly productivity is receiving greater emphasis in tenure and promotion decisions.

In terms of the content of training programs, there was again little variability across institutions. Two trends were noted. First, the frequency with which faculty indicated that working with parents and working with regular educators was becoming a new emphasis did seem surprising. As noted in the results section, these skill areas have long been considered important for special educators. The impetus for this new training emphasis appears to be coming from the needs of local districts which, according to faculty perceptions, reflect a more meaningful involvement with parents and an increased use of resource rooms and other part-time placements.

A second feature of training program content was the intense emphasis on developing assessment skills. In fact, the issue of conducting assessments arose repeatedly in comments regarding training, local district practice, and inservice needs. On the one hand there was a general concern about the quality and value of assessments as they are currently being used in local schools. Yet, while many faculty questioned the extensive attention and allocation of resources to assessment, their own programs, not infrequently, included more than one course related to assessment. The extent of the comments regarding assessment suggests that this area is becoming a focal point of special education. Based on a few individual comments, it appears that assessment may be one area that sets special education practice apart from regular education, perhaps because conducting assessments requires certain technical skills above those of a regular educator.

A major focus of this study was to explore the influence of federal programs and priorities on departments of special education. However, the results offer little surprising or new information. Almost every faculty member, in fact, viewed federal grants as positive influences within a department. Student stipends provided full-time graduate students who in turn encouraged research and generally enriched departments, and travel money allowed faculty to maintain contact with the broad professional field.

Interestingly, faculty do not see their programs influenced by changes in federal priorities; they see the "core" program as something that they have developed and that they control, and federal dollars only serve to enrich or add to this core. While several faculty did mention that their vocational education, early childhood, severely handicapped or other low-incidence programs would perish without federal grant money, they still did not perceive the federal government as influential in shaping the nature of the training offerred. Overall, there was limited acknowledgement of the extent to which the federal priorities or influences have resulted in the creation of specialty areas.

The only negative influence reported by faculty was that grants tend to take time away from teaching.

The area of state department of education/IHE interaction, which is almost exclusively limited to divisions of certification, engendered some lively discussion. As noted earlier, faculty do not perceive themselves as having a great deal of influence or power in setting certification policies. They think the SEA overresponds to the needs of their local districts in setting standards that require minimal levels of training and specialization. Despite the criticism leveled at the state, faculty reported that their department benefitted from maintaining a good relationship with the state certification department. The department was dependent on program approval, and changes in certification policies tended to result in maintaining part-time graduate enrollments in many IHEs. Clearly, there was a love-hate relationship with the state department.

There was not much evidence of collaboration between local education agencies and departments of special education. When questioned about local practices, most faculty said they had limited knowledge outside the schools in which they do supervision or research. Nonetheless, faculty did note that there is tremendous variability among districts in terms of implementation of P.L. 94-142. The one area where there had been substantial interaction was in inservice training. This interaction has almost disappeared, however, due primarily to the cuts in federal funds for inservice training. The reduction in inservice activities appears to cause great concern, as there was a pervasive feeling that current inservice models are ineffective and until new approaches are developed it is probably reasonable to deemphasize this training. Furthermore, many faculty consider inservice to be a responsibility of state and local education agencies.

Finally, in terms of philosophy, the faculty interviewed by-and-large acknowledged that special education policy and practices are firmly rooted in the child deficit model and that this approach to diagnosis and remediation of individual weakness was pervasive. Nonetheless, about a third of those interviewed, with varying degrees of commitment, did feel that the field should change from this perspective. These individuals preferred to see movement toward a broader ecological or social-environmental perspective in defining disability and developing interventions.

There was little division, however, on the question of maintaining a separate profession. The majority of the faculty felt strongly about the need to maintain a separate and strong identity for special education. While most felt that special educators did need a sound knowledge of regular education practices, they nonetheless felt that handicapped children still needed the benefits of specialized services. There were even stronger feelings that if special education were to lose its individual status and visibility, the rights of handicapped children would be severely jeopardized. However, those individuals who expressed the belief that regular and special education should be combined, thought that this was, in fact, the intent of P.L. 94-142.

This report has attempted to provide some insight into departments of special education. It was never the intent to provide definitive answers or widely generalizable statistics. Given the lack of substantive information about departments and faculty, the study was always seen as being exploratory. As such, it may have raised more questions than it has answered. If however, it stimulates further research into the important area of how and by whom new personnel are being trained, it will have accomplished its purpose.

REFERENCES

Algozzine, R. (1982). Issues in personnel preparation. In J. Ysseldyke and R. Algozzine (Eds.) Issues in special and remedial education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Biklen, D. (Ed.). (1985). Achieving the complete school: Strategies for effective mainstreaming. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Birch, J.W., & Reynolds, M.C. (1982). Special education as a profession. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 2(4), 1-13.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D. (1979). Educational research (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Cruickshank, W.M. (1971). Special education, the community and constitutional issues. In D.L. Walker and D.P. Howard (Eds.), Special education: Instrument of changes in education for the 70s. Selected papers from the University of Virginia Lecture Series, 1970-71, 5-12.

Currence, C. (1985, June 12). Major universities adopt tougher teacher-training requirements. Education Week, p. 5.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). Beyond the commission reports: The coming crisis in teaching. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

De Sola Pool, I. (Ed.). (1954). Trends in content analysis. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Dunn, L.M. (1968). Special education for the mildly retarded--Is much of it justifiable? Exceptional Children, 35 (1), 5-22.

Etzioni, A. (Ed.). (1969). The semi professions and their organization. New York: Free Press.

Feistritzer, C.E. (1983). The condition of teaching: A state by state analysis (A Carnegia Foundation Technical Report). Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation.

Feistritzer, C.E. (1985, August). Commentary by Publisher. Teacher Education Reports. Washington, DC: Feistritzer Publications, p. 7.

Franchak, S.J., & Spirer, J.E. (1979). Evaluation handbook: Guidelines and practices for follow-up studies of special education populations (vol. 2). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1973). The discovery of grounded theories: Strategies for qualitative research (2nd ed.). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Grosenick, J., & Huntze, S. (1980). National needs analysis in behavior disorders. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri, Department of Special Education.

Guba, E. (1978). Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1982). What's still right with education. Phi Delta Kappan, 64 (4), 231-35.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1983). Guess who's coming to college: Your students in 1990. Washington, DC: National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1985). All one system: Demographics of education, kindergarten through graduate school. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Education Leadership.

Kaplan, G.R. (1985). Items for an agenda: Educational research and the reports on excellence. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Kauffman, J.M. (1980). From the editor. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 1 (1), ix-xiii.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kirst, M.W. (1985, Spring). Renewing the teaching profession. The Stanford Magazine. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Lanier, J.E. (1984). The future of teacher education: Two papers (Occasional Paper No. 79). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Lieberman, L.M. (1985). Special education and regular education: A merger made in heaven? Exceptional Children, 51(6), 513-516.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Merton, R., Fishe, M., & Kendall, P.L. (1956). The focused interview. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Mesinger, J.F., & Hanvick, L.J. (1966). And the beanstalk grows. Exceptional Children, 32 (6), 577-580.

Mesinger, J.F. (1985). Commentary on "A rationale for the merger of special and regular education" or, Is it now time for the lamb to lie down with the lion? Exceptional Children, 51 (6), 510-512.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

National Education Association. (1980-81). Status of the American public school teacher, 1980-81. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Noel, M.M., Smith-Davis, J., & Burke, P.J. (in press). Personnel to educate the handicapped in America: A status report. College Park, MD: Institute for the Study of Exceptional Children and Youth, University of Maryland.

Oaks, J. (1983). Tracking and ability grouping in American schools. Some constitutional questions. Teachers College Record, 84, 801-819.

Patton, M. (1984). Qualitative evaluation methods (6th ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Reynolds, M.C. (Ed.). (1980). A common body of practice for teachers: The challenge of Public Law 94-142 to teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Rodman, B. (1985, August 1). Public favors pay raises, competency testing for teachers, N.E.A./Gallup Poll indicates. Education Week. Washington, D.C., S2.

Schlechty, P. (1984). Restructuring the teaching occupation: A proposal. Paper prepared for the American Educational Research Association Project: Research Contributions for Educational Improvement.

Schlechty, P., & Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. The Elementary School Journal, 83 (4), 469-487.

Schwartz, H., & Jacobs, J. (1979). Qualitative sociology: A method to the madness. New York: The Free Press.

Sellitz, C., Wrightsman, L.S., & Cook, S.W. (1976). Research methods in social relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Smith, G. (1979). Certification, employment and attrition of special education professional personnel in Michigan. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University College of Education.

Smith-Davis, J., Burke, P. J., & Noel M. M. (1984). Personnel to educate the handicapped in America: Supply and demand from a programmatic viewpoint. College Park, MD: Institute for the Study of Exceptional Children and Youth, University of Maryland.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1984). Methodological considerations in qualitative research. The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 9(4), 296-303.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51(2), 102-111.

Sykes, G. (1983). Contradictions, ironies, and promises unfulfilled: A contemporary account of the status of teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(2), 87-93.

Taylor, S.J., & Ferguson, D. (1985). A summary of strategies utilized in model programs and resource materials. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Integration of students with severe handicaps into regular schools. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

U.S. Department of Education. (1985). To assure the free appropriate public education of all handicapped children. Seventh Annual Report to Congress on the implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Weatherly, R.A. (1979). Reforming special education: Policy implementation from state level to street level. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Weaver, W.T. (1981). The talent pool in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (3), 32-36.

Weintraub, F.J., & Ramirez, B.A. (1985). Progress in the education of the handicapped: An analysis of P.L. 98-199, the education of the handicapped act amendments of 1983. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

APPENDIX 1

Noel/Fuller
2/84

Federal Policy Effects on Special Education Teacher Preparation
Narrowing the Study Questions

This paper sharpens our study focus in two ways. First, research assertions are stated which serve to set the parameters of our investigation and define what we will not examine. These assertions or working hypotheses specify those issues which will be explored across our three substudies: the review of federal personnel development initiatives, analysis of variation between states in teacher training, and our in-depth reporting of field perspectives both within IHE special education departments and LEA's.

Second, this outline specifies those issues around which we will tentatively build our interview instrument. The Advisory Group discussion helped us refine the most critical issues within university special education departments.

II Guiding Research Assertions

We would appreciate brief comments from you on the desirability of stating "testable" research assertions early on in our investigation. We feel these could serve as benchmarks to contrast against our interview data and literature work. We have also left room beside each question for you to comment on how the proposition might be refined or made more concrete from **your** point of view. If you have additional thoughts which apply to the research assertion approach in general, please note that at the end of the section.

Federal Policy

1. A wide spectrum of federal programs and legislated policies have boosted **demand** for educators skilled in teaching handicapped children and youth.

Is this a high priority study area?

Could the question be better stated? Yes No

How would you refine the question?

2. Federal efforts -- especially teacher training provisions (Part D) of PL 94-142 -- have succeeded in **expanding the number** of special education **teachers and staff.**

Is this a high priority study area?

Could the question be better stated? Yes No

How would you refine the question?

3. In the absence of clear knowledge of their relative effects, the federal government employs **four methods of implementing** policy goals related to special education personnel preparation: (a) tight regulation of local school's procedures and the organization of instruction, (b) categorical funds to local schools which act as carrots but which are tied to regulation, (c) loosely-controlled funding of teacher training and R&D activities within colleges and universities (IHE's), and (d) direct benefit payments to handicapped individuals, much of which flows to staff training activities within service agencies. We are especially interested in the following related assertions or issues:

i. **Little coordination** among these programs occurs at the federal level. Nor has much thought been given to how consolidation of these disparate efforts boost their collective impact on the number and quality of trained special education staff.

ii. The federal emphasis on regulating schoolwide procedures and tightening cooperation between school staff is creating the need for management skills among special education teachers -- and deemphasizing specific classroom instructional skills and the development of better instructional practices. Within IHE's, teacher training programs have not adjusted to this new role for special education staff. Within LEA's, school staff are largely dissatisfied with new demands being placed on them and with the skill levels of the graduates.

iii. Federal policy contains a basic conflict: On one hand, federal efforts spurred the creation and maintenance of a differentiated profession called "special education," with its categorical funding and distinct methodologies and practices. On the other hand, the assimilationist philosophy embodied within mainstreaming encourage integration of special and regular education. This creates confusion and tension within Colleges of

Education.

Is this a high priority study area?

Should it be better stated? Yes No

How would you refine the question?

Local Viewpoints

4. Changing levels of federal and state support of education for the handicapped has had both positive and negative effects on the legitimacy and capacity of special education departments within IHE's, depending on the values of specific individuals and institutions. We are particularly curious about the following areas:

i. Federal policy and R&D funds have increased the number of tenure-track and research staff working within special education departments.

ii. Federal presence has increased the emphasis placed on teacher training and service efforts by special education departments (recognizing variation among IHE's).

iii. Federal policies and resources, have created a reactive posture among IHEs. Thus, IHE's have focused on shaping training programs to fit credentialling requirements and acting as entrepreneurs in obtaining federal funds, in contrast to questioning legislative wisdom and assumptions, such as how we define "learning handicaps" or organize instructional practices.

iv. Federal policy has shifted special education departments more toward inservice training of teachers.

v. Federal policy has encouraged instruction in knowledge which can be most easily taught and routinized -- related to the law and procedural compliance -- rather than instruction in more complex topics related to improving instructional methods, including classroom management, curriculum development, and skills necessary in accomplishing schoolwide reform and staff coordination.

vi. Little agreement exists within and among special education departments over the boundaries or priorities of special education as a field, such as what should be taught in teacher preparation programs and how, high priority research areas, and research methodology.

Is this a high priority set of research issues?

Can they be stated better? Yes No

How would you change the wording?

5. Local school (LEA) staff generally are dissatisfied with preservice and inservice training in special education. Teachers indicate that training for complying with procedural matters is overemphasized; little assistance in how to improve instructional programs is available.

Is this an important research area?

Can the question be better worded? Yes No

How would you improve the question?

II Study Areas for IHE Interviews

The second step we have taken is to clarify specific issues areas which we want to cover in our interviews within special education departments. The research assertions above help to frame topical issues and establish "testable" propositions. But actual interview questions must flow from more generic issue areas and be phrased in more objective or neutral terms.

We will begin our investigation with three assumptions:

1. We assume that federal policies and resources have contributed to special education department/program attempts to build greater capacity and legitimacy. This growth, however, can not solely be attributed to the federal presence.

2. We assume that in seeking growth and reputation IHE's may organize

their special education departments and reshape faculty roles in different ways, becoming more reactive to mandated procedures or credentialling requirement (**bureaucratic model**), acting to increase enrollments and funding independent of a cohesive mission (**entrepreneurial-market model**), or pursuing a self-determined set of priorities independent of environmental pressures (**professional model**).

3. We assume that each of these organizational strategies can be influenced by (a) federal and state regulatory action, (b) R&D and technical assistance activity which encourages more locally-determined problem definition and solution, (c) directives stemming from actors inside the IHE but external from the special education department, or (d) initiative taken within the department itself. Our interview, in part, will determine the strength of these varied sources of change.

Following are the proposed study areas upon which we might build our IHE interview:

a. **Concrete expansion of the special education department's capacity**: Indicators include, growth/decline (10 and 5 year retrospective) in faculty FTE, research staff, student enrollments (full & part-time) R&D funding, student fellowship/grant support, and research dollars.

b. **Qualitative character of the department**: Student characteristics, faculty performance, perceived teaching quality, views of LEA assistance/development, cooperative or individualistic faculty, average age of faculty.

c. **Structure & priorities of instructional program**: Degree programs offered, degree vs inservice emphasis, perceived degree of interaction across specialization areas, field experience component, training priorities (e.g., research/teaching, theoretical/practical, priority competencies -- procedures, policy, classroom processes, curriculum materials, child assessment, schoolwide role within IEP and coordination with mainstreaming, training to become a specialist or regular classroom teacher), length of degree programs.

d. **Sources of legitimacy & power**: Balance among enrollment growth, scholarship, LEA service, research dollars, integration with other departments & disciplines.

e. **External links**: Nature of interaction with federal government issues and quality of interaction with state credentialling agencies and SEAs, work with LEAs, parent groups, and professional associations.

f. **Defining the special education field**: Faculty and student beliefs about what the field should emphasize and not include, theory vs practice, procedural requirements vs best classroom & school practices, child-centered research vs organizational/policy research, methodologies; have federal & state actions shifted the profession's focus in desirable or undesirable ways (less emphasis on basic research or on curriculum development, for example); has advocacy or local service activity stifled theory development; has the field grown so big it is isolated from other departments in education schools or from related disciplines? Do ideological confusions hamper the field: medical vs social definitions of students' "handicaps" or the conflict between mainstreaming versus training specialists? Has the field become too reactive to centrally determined definitions and assumptions, rather than locally-determined development of best practices? What information do faculty members utilize in their work (journals, handbooks, newsletters).

Have we missed some important areas?

THANKS VERY MUCH FOR YOUR IDEAS AND YOUR TIME

APPENDIX 2

NAME: ____________

Could you briefly describe your department?

How would you describe your students?

How has the composition of your students in special education changed over the past five years? (SES, RACE/ETHNICITY, INSERVICE/PRESERVICE, FULLTIME/PARTTIME, SEX, OTHER)

How would you describe your faculty? (RESEARCHERS, TEACHER-TRAINERS, SERVICE PROVIDERS)

Here is our first scale. On scale 1a please indicate the CURRENT DEPARTMENTAL emphasis paced on each competency areas. On scale 1b please indicate the level of emphasis you believe is MOST APPROPRIATE for that competency. Feel free to comment as you complete the items.

(IF STRONG DIFFERENCES ARE NOTED AND NOT COMMENTED ON, ASK THE INTERVIEWEE TO ELABORATE.)

Have there been significant changes over the past five years in the emphasized competency areas within your department?

What were the changes in response to? (LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES, STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, STATE DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, ADVOCACY GROUPS, OR INDIVIDUAL OR COLLECTIVE PHILOSOPHIES WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT)

Thank you, you've been very thorough with your answers.

Scale 1a, 1b

	Scale 1a			Scale 1b		
	Dept's Current Emphasis			My Own Priority		
Teacher Competencies	Low	Average	High	Low	Average	High
- Knowledge of special education law and mandates	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Learning theory	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Philosophical and historical background of special education	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Classroom behavior management	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Implementation of legal procedures/mandates (IEP) development, multi-disciplinary team assessments)	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Development/adaptation of curricula and materials	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Assessment techniques	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Conducting and using research	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Consultation skills	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Communication with regular educators and related service disciplines	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Working with parents	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Techniques for programming for integration of handicapped students into regular school and community	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Vocational and/Career education	1	2	3	1	2	3
- Other: (Please specify)	1	2	3	1	2	3

I would like to know more about your department's priorities. Please complete Scale 2 which lists a variety of identified departmental priorities. What level of emphasis is placed on each area by your department?

Have you noted a change in departmental priorities over the past five years?

What were those changes related to?

Were the changes relatd to federal monies or the lack thereof?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Scale 2

Department's Priority

Possible Department Priorities	Low	Average	High
- Building enrollments	1	2	3
- Attracting research dollars	1	2	3
- Providing in-service training to local special education staff	1	2	3
- Offering inservice training for regular classroom teachers	1	2	3
- Building the department's national reputation for teacher training	1	2	3
- Building the department's local reputation for teacher training and local service to schools	1	2	3
- Responding to teacher credentialing requirements and pressures	1	2	3
- Advocacy for the improvement of special education	1	2	3

How does your department work with the state department?

Does your department, or a faculty member within the department have input into your state's certification requirements?

Do you have input into the state's requirements concerning the quality or quantity of personnel in special education?

Thank you, again your answers have been very thorough.

Now, I would like to ask you some questions about federal influences. How have federal priorities affected your department?

Has your department received federal grants over the past 10 years? (PLEASE DESCRIBE? WERE THEY DPP GRANTS?)

How have the grants affected your department? (PROBE FOR POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE EFFECTS)

Has the lack of federal grants affected your department? (IN TERMS OF PRESENT LACK OF GRANT MONEY OR IN TERMS OF NEVER HAVING RECEIVED FEDERAL GRANT MONEY)

Has the federal government's priorities (PROGRAM PRIORITIES AS ARTICULATED IN THE REGULATIONS) shaped or changed your department's priorities? (DO YOU GO AFTER GRANT MONEY BECAUSE YOU KNOW THE MONEY I AVAILABLE?) (DO YOU MODIFY OR CHANGE YOUR PROGRAM TO ACCOMODATE NEW FEDERAL INITIATIVES?)

Is there any conflict between federal mandates and the developmental level of the district or region? How do you handle this professionally? (FOR EXAMPLE: A LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY WITH NO DECENT SECONDARY PROGRAM DESIRING OR MANDATED TO RESPOND TO THE FEDERAL INTEREST IN TRANSITION PROGRAMS.)

Here is the scale on federal priorities. Please indicate on scale 3 what priorities you believe most appropriate for federal policy to focus on.

Thank you.

Scale 3

	Federal Policy Should Reflect the Following Priorities:		
	Less Emphasis	Maintain Present Interest	More Emphasis
- Development of model programs and work with local schools	1	2	3
- Support of advocacy efforts	1	2	3
- Basic support of teacher training activities within colleges and universities	1	2	3
- Encouragement of in-service training of special education teachers and staff	1	2	3
- Basic research related to child development and disabilities	1	2	3
- Research applied to school interventions	1	2	3
- Promotion of staff development for regular educators	1	2	3

Now, we would like to know about the local education agencies you wor
with.
Please use scale 4 to record your opinion of the appropriate level of emphasis for the local education agencies to place on the following items.

How have these changed over the past five years?
(IN WHAT AREAS HAVE YOU SEEN PROGRESS? IN WHAT AREAS WOULD YOU LIKE T
SEE MORE PROGRESS?)

Thank you.

Scale 4

	Spending too much effort	Appropriate amount of effort	Not expending enough effort
- Development of in-service training and greater collaboration among school staff	1	2	3
- Assessment and identification of children	1	2	3
- Implementation of LRE — moving to integrate special education kids into appropriate settings	1	2	3
- Completion of required paperwork and compliance reporting	1	2	3
- Working to improve teaching practices	1	2	3
- Development of IEP's and working with participants in the IEP process	1	2	3
- Attempting new ways of balancing individualized instruction with the integration of handicapped students	1	2	3
- Involving special education staff as schoolwide consultants and "change agents"	1	2	3

My last few questions concern your beliefs about the special education profession. I will read a statement and ask you to respond to it.

1) Some special educators argue that federal and state policies have rightfully emphasized the child deficit model as the basis of assessing and categorizing handicapped children and youth. They maintain that categories of handicaps and labeling processes are useful in formulating remedial instructional programs. However, other special educators suggest that many "so-called" handicaps are not deficits in ability, but are caused by the environment's limitations or negative influencies. They maintain that for mildly handicapped children and youth, especially, the focus on ability deficits is not appropriate. The focus on ability deficits is distracting from the more important task of improving social conditions and of seeking the general improvement of education.

Which side has federal and state policy historically emphasized? (MARK ANSWER ON SCALE 5a.)

Emphasis of federal/state policies

Child deficit model	between	Social environmental
1	2	3

Where would you place the emphasis? (Scale 5b)

Child deficit model	between	Social environmental
1 —	2	3

2) Some professionals have expressed concern that special education has become too specialized; that it has isolated itself from its parent profession and from regular education. These professionals also suggest that special education should do more to sensitize and train regular teachers -- candidates and currently employed classroom teachers. On the other hand, other professionals claim that regular education may never become sufficiently concerned with helping students with special needs and that an independent profession of special education is necessary.

Do you think federal and state policy has emphasized one side over the other?
(MARK SCALE 6a)

Emphasis of federal/state policies

Separate Profession	Between	Attention to Regular Ed
1	2	3

Where would you place the emphasis? (MARK SCALE 6b)

Priority of Interviewee

Separate Profession	Between	Attention to Regular Ed
1	2	3

What in your opinion is "screwing-up" the field of special education today?
(WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE? WHAT ONE THING WOULD YOU "RIGHT" BEFORE ANYTHING ELSE?) IN THIS ONE THEY MAY HAVE MENTIONED AN AREA BEFORE WHICH YOU MIGHT REMIND THEM OF; YOU MAY ASK THEM TO COMPARE THEIR ANSWER TO AN EMOTIONAL ANSWER BEFORE.

Dept#_______________

Questionnaire #1

Institute for the Study of Exceptional Children & Youth
University of Maryland

Teacher Training Study
Special Education Department Background Data

The information requested below is of your department of special education. Please mark those questions that do not apply as not applicable (N/A).

* * *

Faculty

1. How many full-time faculty members did the special education department or program have in the following academic years?

   (a.) 1979-80________ (b.) 1984-85________

2. How many part-time instructors were employed in the two academic years?

   (a.) 1979-80________ (b.) 1984-85________

3. Approximately how many full or part-time faculty members are in the following age categories?

	Total Number
(a) 25-35	________
(b) 36-45	________
(c) 46-55	________
(d) 56-65	________
(e) 66 +	________

4. How many tenure lines did the department have during the following academic years?

(a) tenure lines in 1974-75 ________

(b) in 1979-80 ________

(c) in 1984-85 ________

5. Please indicate the number of current faculty members which fit the following categories:

(a) number of faculty members tenured________

(b) number of faculty members in tenure lines but have not been promoted to tenure________

(c) number and type of other:
Other ________ Total other________

6. How many of the following types of positions do you currently have in the department (exclude graduate students)?

(a) number of research associates or professional research staff working full-time within the department or within a directly affiliated research institute (or a similar unit or center). ___________

(b) number of full-time professional staff working with local schools supervising teacher candidates or coordinating service related to R&D projects? ___________

7. Over the past five years (1979-84) how many "soft money" or grant research positions have been converted to full-time faculty positions

Total number________

Students

8. Please indicate the approximate number of undergraduate and graduate students admitted to your special education program during the following two academic years:

Undergraduate	Graduate
(a) 1979-80________	(c) 1979-80________
(b) 1984-85________	(d) 1984-85________

9. What is the average number of semester/quarter credits taken by a student in special education.

(a) average number of undergraduate credits per semester/quarter ________

(b) average number of graduate credits per student per semester/quarter ________

10. Approximately what percent of your graduate and undergraduate students in special education attend classes only in the late afternoon or evening?

(a) percent of undergraduate students attending classes in late afternoon or evening ________

(b) percent of graduate students attending classes in late afternoon or evening ________

11. Approximately what percent of your students in special education are

(a) currently working as regular education teachers ________

(b) teaching in special education but are not fully credentialed in special education ________

12. Approximately what percent of your undergraduate students in special education are:

Undergraduate		Graduate	
(a) Black	________	(a) Black	________
(b) Hispanic	________	(b) Hispanic	________
(c) Asian	________	(c) Asian	________
(d) Other (specify)	________	(d) Other (specify)	________

13. Approximate number of your graduate and undergraduate students in special education who are:

Undergraduate	Graduate
a. male ________	d. male _________
b. female _________	e. female _________
c. handicapped_________	f. handicapped_________

14. How many of your graduate students in special education are receiving the following types of financial aid:

(a) fellowships financed through special education personnel preparation grants _________

(b) assistantships or other aid through federal research and development grants _________

Special Education Department Program & Curriculum.

15. Which of the following academic degrees does your department of special education offer (please check)?

(a) Bachelor's degree_____

(b) Master's degree_______

(c) Teaching credential(s)_____

(d) EdD/PhD degree______________

16. How many of the following degrees were awarded during the 1983-84 academic year?

(a) BA or BS degrees_____

(b) Masters degree________

(c) Teaching credentials_____

(d) EdD/PhD's__________

17. Which of the following formal program areas are offerred in your department (please check)?

Learning/disabilities________
SED/Behavior disorders________
Mentally retarded________
Educationally or mildly handicapped________
Physically handicapped________
Hearing Impaired________
Visually handicapped________
Gifted and Talented________

Early childhood/infant________
Administration________
Severely handicapped________
Austistic________
Resource specialist/teacher________
Bilingual________
Other (specify) ________
____

18. Which of the following sources of federal special education support has the department received over the past five years years (since 1978-1984)?

Program	Number of Awards	Total Funding to Date
- Dean's grant (college)	______	______
- Program assistance grant	______	______
- Other personnel preparation grants (specify) ______	______	______
- Research grants	______	______
- Model demonstration programs	______	______
- Handicapped Children's Early Education grant	______	______
- Severely handicapped/Deaf Blind	______	______
- Other (specify)	______	______

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

19. How much emphasis is placed on the following admission criteria in selecting entering graduate and undergraduate students?

Undergraduate

	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
- Grade point average from high school	1	2	3
- Teaching or related experience	1	2	3
- Interviews/written samples	1	2	3

- Other/Specify ______________________

Graduate

20.

	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
- GRE or Miller Analogy	1	2	3
- Grade point average college work	1	2	3
- Teaching or related experience	1	2	3
- Interviews/written samples	1	2	3
- National Teacher Examination	1	2	3

- Other/Specify ______________________

21. How would you rate your department's visibility and reputation in each of the following areas?

	Needs Improving	Average	Very Strong	Not Part of Mission
- National reputation of training program	1	2	3	NA
- Local reputation of training program	1	2	3	NA
- Local reputation in providing inservice for local school/community agency staff	1	2	3	NA
- National reputation in research and scholarly production	1	2	3	NA
- National reputation in terms of involvement in professional organizations and advocacy	1	2	3	NA

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION!

R# ________

Questionnaire #2

Institute for the Study of Exceptional Children & Youth
University of Maryland

Teacher Training Study
Special Education Faculty Member Background Data

We would appreciate it if you could complete the following questionnaire prior to our visit. All information will remain confidential. If any questions are unclear, we will try to resolve the ambiguity when we meet for the in-depth interview. In advance, thanks very much for your time and ideas.

* * *

1. Male _____ Female _____

2. Age: _____ years

3. How many years have you been affiliated with your current department?

   ______ years

4. Did you work as an instructor, faculty member, or researcher at colleges or universities before your current appointment?

   Yes _____ No _____ Total number of other institutions _____ Total number of years? _____

5. What is your current position in the department (check one)?

   ______ Research Associate or Staff

   ______ Lecturer/Instructor

   ______ Assistant Professor

   ______ Untenured Associate Professor

   ______ Tenured Associate Professor

   ______ Full Professor

6. How many years of teaching experience with handicapped children/youth do you have?

_____ years in regular education _____ years in special education

7. Within what area(s) of teaching and/or research do you specialize?

- _____ learning disabled
- _____ behavior disordered/SED
- _____ mental retardation
- _____ severely handicapped
- _____ mildly handicapped
- _____ autistic
- _____ physically handicapped
- _____ deaf/hearing impaired
- _____ blind/visually impaired
- _____ infant/preschool
- _____ administration & policy
- _____ bilingual/multicultural
- _____ vocational
- _____ other / specify _____________

8. What is your salary for your contract period (please check one category)?

- _____ $10,000 - $15,000
- _____ $15,000 - $20,000
- _____ $21,000 - $30,000
- _____ $31,000 - $40,000
- _____ $41,000 - $50,000
- _____ over $50,000 per year

9. Indicate your major area of study granting institution, and year awarded for each of the following degrees that you have attained.

	Major Area of Study	Degree Received From	Year
BA/BS/BEd			
Teaching credential			
MA/MS/MEd			
Specialist			
EdD/PhD			

10. Which of the following sources of financial aid did you have during your graduate school training? Indicate the approximate percentage of support for each where applicable.

_____ Federal special education fellowships

______ Research assistantships attached to a federal project

______ Research assistantships attached to your academic department

______ Guaranteed student loans (from a private bank)

______ National Direct Student Loans
(from the federal government or the university)

______ Work study from University

______ Parents

______ Your salary or spouse's salary

______ Other / specify ____________

11. How would you rate your department's visibility and reputation in each of the following areas?

	Needs Improving		Very Strong	Not Part of Mission
- National reputation of training program	1	2	3	NA
- Local reputation of training program	1	2	3	NA
- Local reputation in providing inservice for school staff	1	2	3	NA
- National reputation in research and scholarly production	1	2	3	NA
- National reputation in terms of the teacher training program	1	2	3	NA
- National reputation in terms of professional involvement in the field	1	2	3	NA

12. We would like an estimate of how many hours per week you work during an average academic session. Include your professional activities in teaching, research and local service. We would appreciate you being candid in responding.

_____ hours/week

13. Finally, we would like to know how you **currently** distribute your time

across the following tasks and how you would prefer to allocate your work time.

	Currently spend x% of my time	Would prefer to spend x% of my time
A. Teaching: lectures and course preparation	____	____
B. Advising students	____	____
C. Committees and internal university service	____	____
D. Professional activities: reading, talking with colleagues about research or other professional interests	____	____
E. Professional writing/research	____	____
F. Working with local school staff	____	____
G. Advocacy and service to professional associations	____	____